

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MAY 6, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE MINISTERIAL DUTIES of the Registry of Joint Stock Companies have been placed in the hands of the Inland Revenue Department, and the business will, as soon as the requisite changes are made, be transferred to Somerset House. Due notice will be given of the transfer. In the meantime, the business will be conducted, as heretofore, at 13, Serjeants'-inn. Mr. William Henry Cousins (Storekeeper-General of the Inland Revenue) has been appointed Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, and Mr. James Michael (assistant-storekeeper) assistant-registrar.

THE IRISH QUEEN'S COUNSEL who came forth to demolish solicitors with a circular has prudently beat a retreat. We are informed that last week the following notice was posted in the library of the Four Courts at Dublin:—"A letter has been received from the gentleman in reference to whose circular a bar meeting is in contemplation, in which that gentleman admits his error, and apologizes to the bar for what has occurred. The letter will be shown to any member of the bar desiring to see it. It remains for the bar to determine whether any further steps shall be taken. (Signed) G. A. C. May." The letter, and also the requisition of the bar for a meeting to consider the matter, have since disappeared from the notice board, and it is understood that no further action will be taken in the matter.

IT WOULD SEEM, from the interview of a deputation from Ireland and Scotland with the Home Secretary and the Lord Advocate, a report of which will be found elsewhere, that the construction of the Judicature Acts which would abolish the exception of Ireland and Scotland contained in section 18 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, is now admitted, even in those countries, to be the correct one. At all events, the deputation seemed to place their trust in legislation. They asked the Home Secretary to take steps to prevent the judges from assuming jurisdiction to give leave to issue writs for service in Ireland and Scotland, their meaning, we presume, being that the Government should either introduce a Bill restoring the exception, or induce the judges to frame new rules. The Home Secretary promised to consult the Lord Chancellor. On Thursday Lord Cairns informed a deputation of Scottish and Irish members of Parliament who waited upon him on the same subject, that he proposed to suggest to the judges an alteration of the existing rules in the direction indicated by the deputation. While we have always contended that the provisions on this subject of the Acts and rules would not bear any other construction than that which is now by the highest authority stated to be the correct one, we have never approved of the wide power thus conferred on the English courts, and we shall be glad to see the

alteration indicated by the Lord Chancellor carefully carried out.

THE GROAN OF THE SUTOR has this week been extensively heard. An unfortunate concurrence of circumstances in the common law divisions—two judges laid aside by illness, two *Nisi Prius* courts blocked with heavy cases, two or more judges sitting in the Court of Appeal, a chief justice summoned to sit one day on the Judicial Committee, and other judges sitting at the Central Criminal Court—has so far reduced the judicial strength that very little progress has been made with the lists. Witnesses brought up from the country in anticipation of the speedy hearing of cases, have had to be kept in town for days. Jurymen have been summoned, and have attended only to find that, as all the judges were employed elsewhere, their services were not required. The best devised arrangements are liable to temporary failures of this kind, and it would be unreasonable to found upon the condition of matters we have described any inference as to the working of the new system; but it may not be inappropriate to draw attention to the extraordinary multifariousness of the duties now imposed on the judges of the common law divisions, and to advert to the impression, which we believe to be growing in the profession, that one desirable remedy for these blocks at Westminster is to be found in the diminution of the fluctuating element of the Court of Appeal. The system under which puisne judges, whether from their ability and experience fitted to strengthen that court or not, appear for a brief season on the scene, "concur" in the judgments, and then retire to their former haunts, is not satisfactory; and the sooner we reach the consummation, anticipated by the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, of five permanent members of the intermediate court of appeal, the better it will be for suitors and the profession. The state of business in the Chancery Division since the "lock-out" at the Rolls, is probably without parallel in recent times, and we are not surprised to learn that it has excited the anxious deliberation and discussion of a meeting of the learned leaders of the Chancery bar. But it is not easy to see what course such a meeting could take, and we believe that, in point of fact, no course was resolved upon.

LORD SELBORNE'S BILL "to establish a general school of law in England" appears this year without the clause empowering the Senate to establish professorships or lectureships in branches of law or jurisprudence. All the hopes which at one time were entertained that, by a union of the resources of both branches of the profession, provision might be made for a teaching body of the highest efficiency, are now destroyed. The "Queen's General School of Law" is to be a school in which no law is taught. The surrender of one of the main objects for which the friends of legal education have contended would in any case be matter of deep regret; but if the Bill promised to give a satisfactory examining body, which should be altogether independent of what the Lord Chancellor has described as the "efforts at teaching" made by the Inns of Court and the Incorporated Law Society, there would at least be some consolation. If the examining body raised the standard of legal knowledge, the teaching bodies must follow suit, and so, indirectly, the teaching of law might be improved. But what are the provisions of the Bill? Before any rule can be made by the Senate relating to the subjects proficiency in which is to be certified in order to qualify any person to be called to the bar, the greater part of the members of the Senate who are barristers-at-law must concur; and before any rule can be made relating to the subjects proficiency in which is to be certified in order to qualify any person to be admitted as a solicitor, the greater part of the members of the Senate present

who are solicitors must concur (clause 19). Now let us see how the barrister and solicitor members of the Senate are to be elected. Out of the ten elected barristers, four are to be elected by the benchers. Add the Attorney and Solicitor-General, who are *ex-officio* members of the Senate and also benchers, and you have six out of the twelve barrister members who are either benchers or representatives of benchers. Even if we assume that none of the elected barrister members will be benchers, that body will still be able to prevent a majority of the barrister members from being obtained for any rule which might demand a higher standard of attainment than is consistent with the "efforts at teaching" made by the Council of Legal Education. Turning next to the solicitor members of the Senate, we find that four out of the ten elected members are to be chosen by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and the president and vice-president of that society are to be *ex-officio* members; so that here again we have precisely the same state of things as in the case of the Bar, with this additional circumstance, that as the electors are all to be members of the Incorporated Law Society (see clauses 2, 6) the representatives of the Incorporated Law Society will be the sole authority for determining whether the standard of legal education which they have hitherto maintained shall be raised or altered. Now, either the existing standards of examination for the two branches are too low or they are not. If they are not, no reason for change in the examining authority is shown; if they are, it does not seem likely that a new examining body, controlled by the old examining authority, will depart from the traditions of that authority. The proposal seems to us, in short, to be little more than the ancient and favourite device of installing Tweedledum in place of Tweedledee.

THE SECOND REPORT of the Railway Commissioners, which has just been presented to Parliament, shows a considerable increase both in the number and importance of the cases brought before that tribunal. We are glad to observe that the commissioners have divided the cases in which their interference was called for under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. 31), into cases of "undue preference" and cases of "deficient accommodation." The distinction was almost lost sight of by the Court of Common Pleas, but it is of the very essence of the statute. The single case of "deficient accommodation" which was heard by the commissioners in the previous year (the *Dover* case, 18 S. J. 105) was compromised, so the two cases under that head which are noticed in the present report give the first indication of the manner in which the commissioners are prepared to exercise this most difficult branch of their jurisdiction. In the first of these two cases (*Innes v. The London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company*, 2 Nev. & Mac. 155, and *Uckfield Local Board v. The Brighton and South-Eastern Railway Companies*, 19 S. J. 847), the commissioners enjoined the defendants to make a carriage approach to a station, and in the second to open a short connecting line for passenger traffic. Of the "undue preference" cases, which were nine in number, the only one which appears to call for remark is *Diphwya Casson slate Company v. The Festiniog Railway Company* (19 S. J. 219), in which the commissioners very properly held that a railway company cannot make it a condition of treating the public equally that they should be the only carriers. The company attempted to justify the preference on the ground that they were seeking to ward off the threatened competition of a new line, but that such a defence is of no avail had been decided by the Court of Common Pleas in *Harris v. Cockermouth and Workington Railway Company* (6 W. R. 209, 3 C. B. N. S. 693). The commissioners appear to have heard eight arbitrations. Of these one was a rating case, in which a railway company treated certain docks at Grimsby as "having

no rateable value because worked at a loss, while the guardians assessed them at no less than £37,000 a year." On this the report observes that "the guardians were right on the assumption that the docks were as completely part of the railway property as any large station on the line might be, and the railway company were right if the docks and railway were still separate properties," but the commissioners, holding that "the docks had neither the one nor the other character exclusively, but partook of both, amended the assessment accordingly." Considering the extreme difficulty of questions of railway rating and the necessary delay in getting them heard before the High Court, we should not be surprised if this branch of the business of the commissioners should show an increase. It remains to state that the commissioners have heard three applications for through rates under that provision of the Act of 1873 (section 11) which was framed with the object of making it to the interest of one company and the duty of the other to send traffic by the shortest, cheapest, and most convenient route, in cases where two companies own lines which form a continuous communication. Four "working agreements" were approved. Six cases were heard relative to the publication of rates and the distinction of terminals from tolls under section 14, and one as to the conveyance of mails. Three cases were arranged without a hearing. The total appears to be about thirty-two cases in the year, being more than the whole number of cases heard by the courts of law under the Act of 1854. This result alone appears to afford an ample justification for the course taken in constituting the commission, but the whole benefits of that course cannot be estimated by the mere list of cases heard and determined.

THE NEW PRACTICE.

THIRD-PARTY NOTICES.—There can be no doubt that the provisions of the rules relating to this subject are a failure. Except in very simple cases of principal and surety there is little good to be got from them, and it is found impossible to apply them to cases in which such provisions would be of the greatest service in saving expense and delay. All this arises from the timidity of the learned judges in deliberately refusing to carry out in the rules the provision of section 24, sub-section 3, of the Judicature Act, 1873. That provision enables the courts to grant to the defendant "all such relief relating to, or connected with, the original subject of the cause or matter, and in like manner claimed against any other person, whether already a party to the same cause or matter or not, who shall have been duly served with notice in writing of such claim, pursuant to any rule of court or any order of the court, as might properly have been granted against such person if he had been made a defendant to a cause duly instituted by the same defendant for the like purpose." But the corresponding provisions of the rules of court are restricted to the mere decision of the question, and do not enable any relief to be given. As the Master of the Rolls recently said (*Warner v. Twining*, 24 W. R. 536), the only purpose for which third party is brought before the court under ord. 16, rr. 17, 18, is to bind him in the action and preclude him from saying that it had not been properly defended. Lord Justice Mellish has stated that the matter was very carefully considered by the committee of judges, and "they came to the conclusion that, though there was power to do so, it would not be advisable to make any rule which would enable one defendant to obtain relief against another defendant" (*Treleaven v. Bray, ante*, p. 112), the ground for this opinion being that the plaintiff ought not to be kept waiting for his remedy while the defendants are fighting *inter se*. We venture to doubt whether this evil would not, to a great extent

be found to be imaginary; and, in any case, as it is left in the discretion of the judge to allow service of the third-party notice, it would only be necessary to require service of the notice of motion on the plaintiff, to enable him to resist it if he thought it would be injurious to his interests. With great respect, we must suggest the further question whether it is competent for the learned rule-makers to practically repeal a portion of an Act of Parliament.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

SERVICE OF WRIT ON ALIEN DEFENDANT OUT OF JURISDICTION.—ORD. 2, r. 4; ORD. 11, r. 1—FORM OF WRIT—RULES OF COURT, APPENDIX A., PART I, NOS. 2 AND 3.—The direction of Hall, V.C., was applied for with regard to three questions of some importance on Wednesday, May 3rd, in the action of *Baker v. Turner*, which was one for the administration of certain trusts of a will. One of the defendants—a Mr. Camphausen—was a German subject who had married an English lady, also a defendant, and they were both living at Wiesbaden in Germany. *Oswald*, for the plaintiff, applied *ex parte* for leave to issue the writ and serve it, or notice in lieu thereof, upon these two defendants; and the first question was whether Mrs. Camphausen must still be considered an English subject, and be served with the writ itself, or whether she could be considered to have adopted a German domicile, and might therefore be served with notice of the writ as a foreigner. The next question, which was as to the form of the writ or notice, arose out of the decision of the Queen's Bench Division in *Scott v. Royal Wax Candle Company* on the 10th of April (*ante*, p. 469). In that case the court decided that a plaintiff, after having obtained leave to issue and serve notice of a writ out of the jurisdiction, might proceed to sign judgment by default without any further leave, but as the plaintiff in that case had served notice of the writ in the form given in form 3 of appendix A., part 1, of the schedule to the Judicature Act, 1873, stating that the plaintiff might, “by leave of the court or a judge,” proceed to sign judgment in default, a judgment signed by him under ord. 13, r. 6, was set aside on the ground that the notice served upon the defendant was misleading, and Cockburn, C.J., said that the form had evidently been copied in part from the notice given in the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, schedule A., form 3, and ought to be amended as to the leave to proceed to sign judgment. Having regard to this case, counsel asked that the plaintiff might be at liberty to serve a writ or notice thereof without the words “by leave of the court or a judge.” The third question arose out of the Royal proclamation of the 28th of April last, under the Royal Titles Act, which provides that except in writs and certain other instruments not extending in their operation beyond the United Kingdom, the following addition shall be made to the style and titles at present appertaining to the Imperial Crown and its dependencies; that is to say in the Latin tongue in these words, *Indie Imperatrix*, and in the English tongue in these words, “Empress of India.” Although it might be said that a writ or notice for service out of the jurisdiction only operated upon property within the United Kingdom, still, as it was to be served upon alien defendants resident abroad, and it was possible that the plaintiff might proceed to sign judgment by default against these defendants, it was at least doubtful whether the writ or notice could be considered as an instrument not extending in its operation beyond the United Kingdom within the meaning of the proclamation. The Attorney-General had said the previous evening in reply to a question by Mr. G. O. Morgan, Q.C., in another place, that, in respect of all instruments it would be for the authority issuing them to decide whether the addition of Empress could be conveniently dispensed with, and it therefore became necessary for the plaintiff to ask for the direction of the court whether or not the words “Empress of India” ought to be added to the heading of the writ or notice, after the words “Defender of the faith.” Vice-Chancellor Hall said he thought the writ itself had better be served upon Mrs. Camphausen. With regard to the second question he followed the decision of the Queen's Bench Division, and, adopting the suggestion of Cockburn, C.J., gave leave to issue and serve a writ upon Mrs. Camphausen and notice of it upon her husband, omitting the words “by leave of the court or a judge.” With regard to

the other question he must refer the plaintiff to the Clerk of Records and Writs to ascertain what was the practice. *Oswald*, later in the day, mentioned that the Clerk of Records and Writs had been applied to, but he said that he could not make any alteration in the forms of writ and notice given in the schedule to the Judicature Act, 1873, without the authority of the court. He must, therefore, ask his lordship to decide whether or not the title of Empress was necessary, and, if so, to give leave to add it. Vice-Chancellor Hall said—I certainly shall give no direction to alter the form of the writ. Any application for such a purpose should be made to the Lord Chancellor. *Oswald*.—I merely wish to be quite sure that the writ is regular, so that there may be no objection to it for informality in case the plaintiff proceeds by default. The Vice-Chancellor—You must take your chance of that, unless you apply to the Lord Chancellor.

REFERENCES.—Before the Common Pleas Division on Friday, April 28, in a case of *Cruikshank v. The Floating Swimming Baths Company*, an application was made to set aside the certificate of a master under the following circumstances:—The action was commenced in November of last year, and an application was made after the Judicature Acts came into operation to continue the action under the Acts and to allow the defendants to set up a counter-claim. Thereupon, by consent, an order was made that the defendants should be at liberty to plead their counter-claim, that the cause should be referred to a master, and proceedings be continued under the Judicature Acts. The cause was heard by a master and a certificate was given. *Holl*, for the defendants, now moved for an order to set aside the certificate and to call on the master to report to the court, for them to give a decision. The contention was that as the order which referred the cause directed that the proceedings were to be continued under the Judicature Acts, the matter was brought within sections 56 and 57 of the Judicature Act, 1873, and ord. 36, r. 34, and the proper course was for the master not to decide the cause but to report to the court. The court, however, pointed out that (apart from trials by referees, which did not now come in question), the argument used by *White*, for the plaintiff, was correct, namely, that there were two modes of reference now in force, one a reference under sections 56 and 57 of the Judicature Act, 1873, of some question or questions in a cause (or perhaps even of a cause) for report, not for decision; and, secondly, a reference under the Common Law Procedure Act of a cause for decision, the procedure in which was to a great extent the same as formerly. And they also ruled that the direction as to continuing the cause under the Judicature Acts only referred to rules of pleading, evidence, the mode of obtaining judgment, &c., but did not make the reference one under the Judicature Acts, so as to oblige the master to report upon and not decide the cause.

A return just issued shows that the salaries of stipendiary magistrates in London, including Chatham and Dover, for the current year are estimated to amount to £35,500.

On Monday, at the meeting of the Law Amendment Society, held at their rooms, Adam-street, Adelphi, a paper was read by Mr. Clair J. Greene, LL.D., on “The wasteful expenditure of legislative effort consequent upon an adhesion to the ancient effects of prorogation.” In consequence of the absence of the expected chairman (Mr. Evelyn Ashley, M.P.), who was detained in the House of Commons, Mr. A. E. Miller, Q.C., presided. Mr. Greene entered at once upon the meaning of prorogation in the parliamentary sense, and the effects of prorogation and dissolution of Parliaments on Bills suspended and left incomplete, and, after historical references and details, proceeded to draw his conclusion, which was, “To establish the continuity of parliamentary procedure from session to session, and from Parliament to Parliament, recognizing no destructive operation whatever, either in a prorogation or a dissolution, upon measures in progress, and thus assimilating the practice in the procedure of Parliament in its legislative to that which has long been established in its judicial capacity, and attributing to each House that corporate form of existence and of activity which it has always implicitly asserted by its standing orders.” After some discussion a vote of thanks was passed to the reader of the essay.

PERMISSIVE WASTE.

I.

At common law no remedy lay for waste, either voluntary or permissive, against lessee for life, or years, or at will, on the ground that the lessee (unlike a tenant in dower, or by the curtesy) obtained his interest in the land by the act of the lessor, who ought to have restrained his lessee by covenant, condition, or otherwise against committing waste (see *Lady Shrewsbury's case*, 5 Co. R. 13b, 2 Inst. 299). The Statute of Gloucester (6 Ed. 1, c. 5) provided that "a man from henceforth shall have a writ of waste in the chancery against him that holdeth by the law of England or otherwise for term of life or for term of years." This provision did not include a tenant at will, and the landlord has at the present day no legal remedy against him for permissive waste (see Co. Lit. 57a; *Panton v. Isham*, 3 Lev. 359; *Harnett v. Mailand*, 16 M. & W. 257, 262). A tenant for a year, or from year to year, however, was within the statute (see 2 Inst. 302, Co. Lit. 54b).

The early authorities seem to have taken it for granted that, under this enactment, the term "waste" would include all kinds of waste. Thus in *Weymouth v. Gilbert* (2 Roll, Abr. 816, "Waste," pl. 36), it was held that if a tenant suffered a chamber to be in decay for want of plastering, whereby the main timbers became rotten, an action of waste would lie (see also *Newell v. Downing*, *Ibid.*, and *Corbett v. Stonehouse*, *Ibid.*; 2 Inst. 145). But the action of waste fell into disuse long before it was abolished by 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 27, and in moulding the substituted action on the case in the nature of waste the courts seem at one time to have been inclined to establish the doctrine that it should not be available for permissive waste. Thus in *Gibson v. Wells* (1 Bos. & Pull. N. R. 290), Mansfield, C.J., distinctly laid it down that an action on the case for permissive waste was not maintainable; in this case, however, the defendant was only tenant at will to the plaintiff. In *Herne v. Berbow* (4 Taunt. 764), the court are reported to have said that, "an action on the case does not lie against a tenant for permissive waste," but as they referred to the *Countess of Shrewsbury's case* it has been suggested that they intended to restrict their observation to the case of a tenant at will; it is to be noticed, however, that the "premises were demised by the plaintiff to the defendant by lease, which contained no covenant to repair." In *Jones v. Hill* (7 Taunt. 392), Gibbs, C.J., also seems to have treated it as doubtful (see p. 396) whether an action for permissive waste would lie against a tenant for years. But in delivering judgment in *Yellowly v. Gower* (11 Ex. at p. 294) the court, after remarking that none of the three last-mentioned cases appeared to be well reported, held that there was no doubt of the liability of tenants for terms of years for permissive waste, "for they are clearly put on the same footing as tenants for life, both as to voluntary and permissive waste, by Lord Coke (1 Inst. 53)." Since this last decision it has been regarded as clearly settled that tenants for years, or for life are liable at law for permissive waste.

The question of whether courts of equity shall take cognizance of permissive waste does not seem to have arisen until 1714, when Lord Cowper, C., held, on a bill against the executors of a jointress to have a satisfaction out of the assets for permissive waste upon the jointure of the testatrix, that there was "no remedy at law or in equity for permissive waste after the death of the particular tenant" (*Turner v. Buck*, 22 Vin. Abr. "Waste," p. 522, pl. 9). And in a case of *Lord Castlemaine v. Lord Craven* (22 Vin. Abr. tit. "Waste," p. 523), the Master of the Rolls laid it down that "the court never interposes in cases of permissive waste, either to prohibit or give satisfaction, as it does in cases of wilful waste." Lord Hardwicke, however (if his decision is correctly reported), seems to have held a different view, for in *Parteriche v. Powlet* (2 Atk. 383),

on an exception being taken to the master's report, that he had charged the tenant for life, without impeachment of waste, with several sums for repairs of tenants' houses upon the estate, Lord Hardwicke overruled the exception, and said that, notwithstanding tenant for life is without impeachment of waste, "he shall be obliged to keep tenants' houses in repair, unless the charge is excessive, and shall not suffer them to run into ruin." But the correctness of the report of this case has been doubted (see *per* Lord Redesdale in *Clinan v. Cooke*, 1 Sch. & Lef. at p. 35; and *per* Lord Cranworth in *Powys v. Blagrave* 4 De G. M. & G. at p. 454). It seems, at all events, that the case did not influence the current of decision, for in *Wood v. Gaymore* (Amb. 394), decided only a few years afterwards, the Master of the Rolls refused to give relief in respect of permissive waste. In that case a bill was filed by a remainderman against the legal tenant for life, seeking (*inter alia*) to compel the latter to put and keep the premises in repair; and it was strongly urged that, as no action could be brought at law, owing to the refusal of another remainderman to join in the action, and as the tort committed by the tenant for life would die with her, the court ought to interfere. On the other hand, it was said that no precedent existed for such a decree as was sought, and that to make it would tend to harass tenants for life, and that suits of this kind would be attended with great expense in depositions about the repairs. The Master of the Rolls declared that as no precedent could be found he would not make one.

The arguments in this case afford some insight into the motives which may have led to the refusal of courts of equity to interfere in cases of permissive waste, but in the early judgments there is a singular absence of grounds for the course thus taken. It may be supposed that the difficulty of knowing how far the tenant for life might repair the dilapidations before his death, would furnish an additional reason for declining to interfere. But the intervention of the court was refused equally after the death of the tenant for life, when the amount of dilapidations could be ascertained with exactness. We have already seen that in the earliest case on the subject, it was laid down that no remedy existed in equity for permissive waste after the death of the tenant for life. And in the important case of *Marquis of Lansdowne v. Marchioness of Lansdowne* (1 Jac. & W. 522), decided in 1820 by Sir T. Plumer, the same rule was adopted. An account was prayed (see 1 Mad. 126) of the dilapidations permitted by a legal tenant for life without impeachment of waste in and about a mansion-house and buildings at the time of his death, and of the sum of money that were necessarily paid and expended by the remainderman in repairing the said mansion-house in consequence of the said dilapidations. The case of *Parteriche v. Powlet* was cited, but the Master of the Rolls held that no account of the dilapidations could be decreed, observing that "with respect to incumbents the law was otherwise, and accordingly suits against their representatives were very common; but no instances of such suits by remaindermen had occurred."

Passing over cases which, although they have been cited as bearing on the question, were really decided on different grounds, we now come to the important case of *Powys v. Blagrave* (Kay, 495), in which an ingenious attempt was made to obtain an indirect remedy against the equitable tenant for life through the trustees. In this case a bill was filed by trustees at the instance of remaindermen alleging that the persons entitled in remainder insisted that it was the duty of the trustees to put and keep the estates in repair, that they had required the trustees to do so, and that the trustees had repeatedly applied to the tenant for life to comply with such requisition, but he declined to do so, and praying that the trusts of the will might be carried into execution and the tenant for life be restrained from receiving the rents and profits or interfering with the management of the estates. Wood,

V.C., after carefully examining all the cases on the subject, came to the conclusion that "It is the settled doctrine of this court that there are no means of interfering with permissive waste. . . . It is not possible to obtain a remedy against permissive waste indirectly through the medium of a trust created in the property. If I were to hold that, it would be most inconvenient. If every trustee is to be considered liable . . . in cases of permissive waste for want of repairs the difficulty which is now felt of getting respectable persons to act as trustees would be increased. I can foresee no end to the demands which would be made upon trustees by remaindermen coming into possession of the trust property, who might think it not sufficiently repaired, if they might say to the trustees, 'It was your duty to look after the tenant for life; you had the legal estate, and it was your business to see that he was performing all these trusts; as you have not done so we shall fix you with liability.' I think that such a doctrine cannot possibly be established." On appeal, this decision was affirmed by Lord Cranworth (4 De G. M. & G. 448), who said that, "whatever be the legal liability, this court has always declined to interfere against mere permissive waste. . . . There is no precedent for what is asked in this respect; I certainly will not be the first to make one."

We propose in a subsequent article to draw attention to some of the consequences of the doctrine thus established.

Recent Decisions.

FUND FOR RENEWAL OF LEASE.

(*Maddy v. Hale*, V.C.M., 24 W. R. 452.)

In this case a rule, the justice of which has been a good deal controverted, was affirmed. Where, under a direction in a settlement or will, a fund has been formed by trustees of leaseholds out of the rents and profits for the purpose of paying the fine on renewal, but no renewal can be obtained, what is to be done with the accumulated fund? Lord Eldon, in *Tardiff v. Robinson* (stated 27 Beav. 629), held that the tenant for life was entitled to the whole accumulations; that the fund accumulated was, in fact, only a portion of the rents and profits which ought to have been paid to him from time to time. This decision was followed by Romilly, M.R., in *Morres v. Hodges* (27 Beav. 625); but he intimated that his own view would have been to retain the fund and direct the income only to be paid to the tenant for life. In *Re Money's Trusts* (10 W. R. 399, 2 Dr. & Sm. 94) the rule was also reluctantly followed by Kindersley, V.C. It has met with the approval of a distinguished conveyancer (see 3 Davidson's Precedents, 3rd ed., p. 621); but, in spite of this, we may be permitted to express our concurrence in the regret with which Lord Justice James when V.C., in *Re Wood's Estate* (19 W. R. 59, L. R. 10 Eq. 572), spoke of the resurrection of *Tardiff v. Robinson*. The thing seems to us almost too plain for argument. John Jones, when he directs his trustees to set apart a sum for renewing his lease at the end of (say) forty years, means to make a provision for persons who, at and after that time, may be living, and whose interest is to commence after that of the tenant for life has ceased. He thinks it probable that the particular shape which that provision will take will be a new lease, but why should the failure of the means specified lead to a failure of the object contemplated? Will no member of Parliament take steps to secure the speedy re-interment of the ancient and mouldy case howked up by Mr. Beavan?

Reviews.

LAW LEXICON.

WHARTON'S LAW LEXICON OR DICTIONARY OF JURIS-PRUDENCE, &c., &c., REVISED AND ENLARGED. By J. SHIRESS WILL, Barrister-at-Law. The Sixth Edition. Stevens & Sons.

The legislation of the last two years has of course necessitated considerable changes in this well-known work. As the result of an examination of several heads relating to the Judicature Acts, we are led to believe that the effect of these enactments has been accurately and tersely incorporated; the omissions we have found under this head have been trivial; it would be captious, for instance, to complain of such small points as the want of a reference, under the head of Queen's Coroner, to section 29 of the Judicature Act, 1875, under which certain sums are to cease to be payable to that officer. We cannot speak quite so favourably of the mode in which the other legislation which has occurred since the last edition has been incorporated. We find, indeed, that in general the provisions of the Acts are noticed in the proper places; but there are some inexplicable omissions. The most serious of these which we have observed is that under the head of "Notice to quit"—a rather loosely-written article by the way—there is no reference to the important provision on that subject of the Agricultural Holdings Act. Neither under "apprentice," nor "master and apprentice," nor "master and servant," have we found any notice of the provision (section 6) of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act of last year, which render punishable the neglect to provide "medical aid" for an apprentice or servant. Section 26 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, is cited in the article on master and servant, but the compiler appears to have overlooked the fact that this section is materially extended by the Act of last session. Another singular omission is that no mention of the Lodgers' Goods Protection Act occurs in the article on Distress. We may add that there is no head of "Expectant heir"—a personage who has figured rather largely of late in the equity courts.

In still more places we have noticed a want of explicitness in the information given. What is the use, for instance, under the head of "Puffer," of stating from Lord St. Leonards's "Vendors and Purchasers" (14th ed.) the former rules of equity as to the employment of a puffer, and then ending by a mere reference to "the invalidity in certain cases, of sales by auction of land, by reason of the employment of a puffer, see 30 & 31 Vict. c. 48"? And under "Charitable Uses" the provisions of 9 Geo. 2, c. 26, are fully given and the exempted institutions are enumerated, but the numerous amending Acts which have removed so many of the restrictions imposed by the original statute are merely stated thus: "See also 24 & 25 Vict. c. 9, amending the law as to the conveyance of land for charitable uses, amended by 25 & 26 Vict. c. 17; 26 & 27 Vict. c. 106; 27 & 28 Vict. c. 13; 29 & 30 Vict. c. 57; and 31 & 32 Vict. c. 44. Surely it would not have been difficult to have given in a short compass the purport of the amendments effected by these acts? So also under "Fixtures," while the effect of section 3 of 14 & 15 Vict. c. 25, is given, all that is said of section 53 of the Agricultural Holdings Act is, "See also the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 92)." The heading "Chamber Clerks of the Judges" is as follows:—"As to their position since the coming into force of the Judicature Acts, see Jud. Act, 1873, s. 79, amended by Jud. Act, 1875, s. 35." This would not give any very definite information to a reader who wanted to know what were the duties of the chamber clerks. The article on the "Great Seal" is also very meagre and unsatisfactory.

The style of a law book is not expected to be elegant, but the language should be grammatical, and we think

Mr. Will might have done more to improve some parts of the work in this respect. We find under the head of "Distress" the following singular statement:—
"2. The animal or other thing distrained. The distrainer cannot use it for his profit, though he may do so to keep it in a good state (*as if it be a horse*) of health; if he use it for his profit the distraisee may interfere. Neither may he enjoy the increment thereof (as the eggs laid by a hen), but *they* must be kept or accounted for to the distraisee." And it need hardly have been stated under "Serjeants'-inn" that "there is a group of buildings behind Fleet-street called also Serjeants'-inn, but it is not a law society."

Notwithstanding the defects to which we have alluded we think the book has on the whole been fairly well edited, and we must not fail to do justice to its great utility. We believe that there are few legal terms left unexplained, and there are few practitioners who do not at some time or other find it necessary to consult such a work.

PHILOSOPHY OF LAW.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LAW. By HERBERT BROOM, LL.D., &c., &c. London: Maxwell. 1876.

Dr. Broom has furnished to the world some useful works of a practical nature. In his "Commentaries on the Common Law" he provided students with a somewhat bulky, but an accurate and not uninteresting, introductory view of the subject. His treatise on "Legal Maxims" is a work of frequent reference, and of considerable merit, though by no means scientific in its structure. Perhaps his other works are not of equal value; but certainly in none of these writings is there anything which would lead those familiar with them to expect from his pen a treatise on the philosophy of law. Nevertheless, such a work is here presented to them in the shape of a small volume of about 300 pages, printed in the ample type which the author loves. Those who desire to know in what, according to Dr. Broom, the philosophy of law consists, will learn from his title-page that it is "Notes of Lectures delivered during Twenty-three years (1852-1875) in the Inner Temple Hall," and from the text of the work that it signifies a blotted sketch of some elementary rules of the common law, interspersed with abstracts of reported cases and hints of a practical nature, and set off with numerous and spacious platitudes. The confused and slovenly style in which the book is written may be judged of from the following extract:—"Cases which have been judicially recognized and have thus become precedents *must be conformed to*, though sometimes, after the lapse of years, they are found to have been erroneously adjudged; when this is so, either the precedents will still be followed on the ground that it is inexpedient to disturb the established law, or *they will be expressly dissent from and overruled*. . . . A *dictum*, resolution, or judgment which has long been accepted and recognized by the profession will be dissent from if shown to have been erroneous." This passage appears to lay down three propositions—first, that decisions, however erroneous, must be followed; secondly, that dissent is a species of conformity; and thirdly, that decisions will not be followed if erroneous. It is much as if one should say black is not white; black is either white or black; black is white. As, however, some of our readers may think that the words omitted from the above passage would, if supplied, reconcile these apparent contradictions, we subjoin the omitted part: "In a case having reference to the poor law it was observed, *per judicem*, 'The case is governed by a long series of decisions. . . . Looking at the reasons for these decisions, I think that they are founded on a mistake. When it is quite clear that there is a mistake, we are not bound to follow a previous case, but we may act here on the maxim *communis error facit jus*.' The above maxim, however, cannot fairly be used for casting opprobrium upon our law" (!) We have transcribed the

whole passage; we fear it affords no explanation of the difficulty; but it contains a very remarkable sentence. Who the persons are who use the maxim cited for "casting opprobrium on our law," why it should be so used, or whether it is in fact so used at all, we can no more tell than we can guess why the contents of this volume should be called the "Philosophy of Law."

Passing from the prefatory observations, in which the above passage occurs, the author proceeds to make clear to the student the idea of a contract as follows:—"The word 'contract' conveys the idea of persons being drawn together in respect of some subject-matter, and by some common motive." Now, though it might very properly be said that the guests at a hospitable table were drawn together by the common motive of enjoying a good dinner, we should scarcely say that a contract existed between them; while, on the other hand, it would take long to find a "common motive" between the vendor, say, of oil wells, and the company to which he is effecting the sale. We are further told that "privity indicates the tie between and connecting parties," and, farther on, that "if there be no privity between parties there can be no contract or agreement between them." It is indeed, hard to see how persons can be "drawn together" so as to be "tied," if there is no tie; and we can only add to Mr. Broom's pathetic question—"Why should a man be bound by stipulations to which he is altogether a stranger—to which he has not expressly or impliedly assented?"—the further question, Why should the public be treated under the name of philosophy of law to such empty verbiage? It would be a waste of time to point out in detail the ludicrous inconsistency which prevails throughout between the title of this work and its contents. It is sufficient to say that, so far from dealing with the subject in a broad and scientific spirit, the author has constructed his book on the narrowest basis of common law, and that, although a person unacquainted with law might certainly acquire from it some knowledge which might be useful, it cannot be even recommended as an introductory manual. We cannot understand how out of a twenty-three years' experience in lecturing, any author, and still less how the author of "Legal Maxims," could have prepared no better diet to set before the public under this ambitious and high-sounding title.

OATHS.

OATHS IN THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE: A MANUAL FOR THE USE OF COMMISSIONERS TO ADMINISTER OATHS IN THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE IN ENGLAND. BY THOMAS W. BRAITHWAITE, of the Record and Writ Clerks' Office, &c. Stevens & Sons.

The allusion in the preface of this book to the thirty-five years' service of its author will remind very many readers of occasions on which they have profited by Mr. Braithwaite's courteous readiness to afford information on matters connected with the department upon the practice of which he has long been recognized as the best authority. The feeling which found expression some two years ago in the solicitors' testimonial would, doubtless, secure for the present volume a cordial welcome; but, independently of this, the publication is very opportune. There have been few subjects connected with the Judicature Acts on which more perplexity has been felt than that of the powers and duties of commissioners to administer oaths in the Supreme Court. As our own columns have shown, the most conflicting views have been entertained as to their powers, their proper designation, and the local limits of their jurisdiction. On all these points Mr. Braithwaite's book will be found to supply the most authentic information available until the matters of doubt have received judicial solution. Thus, to take only one instance, upon the question which a correspondent raised a few weeks ago, as to whether it would be sufficient for a commissioner to use the designation, "A commissioner, &c.", Mr. Braithwaite,

after discussing and stating the correct designation, says that the forms invented have varied from the ambiguous conciseness of "A commissioner, &c.," to the elaborate explicitness of "A London commissioner to administer oaths in her Majesty's Supreme Court of Judicature in England"; and he refers to an instance in which the following extraordinary form came under his notice:—"A commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery in England, and a solicitor in the Supreme Court of Justice in Chancery." "The truth is," he says, "that commissioners are unwilling, and naturally so, to write thirteen words or more in designating their authority. . . . The writer ventures to suggest that one word with four initial letters would answer every practical purpose. Thus 'A.B., comr., S.C.J.E.' might be sufficient." Other points of doubt are discussed with equal care; and the work will, we doubt not, become the recognized guide of commissioners to administer oaths. The introductory chapter contains full practical directions and forms of applying for the office of commissioner, and in part 2 there are given a large number of forms of jurats and oaths.

PROCTORS AND SOLICITORS.

We have been favoured with the following authentic report of the observations of Lord Penzance in the Court of Arches, at Lambeth Palace, on March 19, 1876, in the case of *Crisp v. Martin*.

Lord PENZANCE.—Before entering upon the immediate matter, I should like to dispose of a suggestion which has been made in the case about which I really have no doubt. It has been suggested that the existing number of proctors is likely to dwindle down, and that this would be a very serious public grievance to the suitors of this court. On the other side it has been argued that, even if the number did so dwindle down as to consist of not more than one, still this court could do nothing to remedy the evil. I am very clear upon this—that this court, unless there is any statute which has not been brought to my notice to the contrary, has, like other courts, the power of indicating under what circumstances, and subject to what conditions, the officers who practise in it should have right to such practice; subject to statute, each court would, I think, have a right to indicate what should be necessary for a man to be admitted as an attorney or proctor as the case might be. Therefore I have no doubt that if the number should dwindle down to so small a number that it can be shown to the court that the public are in any way likely to suffer, this court would modify its rules with regard to the admission of proctors so as to cure that evil. But that is not the present state of things, and that is not the ground upon which the present application is based. The present application is based upon what is called public policy in the matter, and based upon the statement that in analogous cases, occurring one after another, the Legislature has removed the restriction which, before these Acts of the Legislature, existed upon the practice of solicitors in various courts where proctors alone could practise before, and has thrown the practice open to the general legal body of practitioners in the country, and I am asked upon a view of that policy to do by the act of this court what has hitherto been done only by the Legislature. I think it must be admitted that, however strongly that policy may be delineated in the Acts which have passed, it is a somewhat forcible step which this court is asked to take in usurping the place of the Legislature in the matter, and dealing with a strong hand with the rights of individuals upon a supposition of some general policy which has been enacted in the Acts of the Legislature. Now the review of the Acts which has been put before me places the matter in this light:—It appears, by the statute of 53 Geo. 3, c. 127, that there was a distinct provision, accompanied by a penalty, precluding anybody from acting as a proctor who had not been properly admitted and enrolled as such, and I can agree with Mr. Cookson's argument that under this a man must be admitted and enrolled as a proctor, otherwise he cannot practise; but that it

does not go beyond that, and does not prohibit this court from altering the rules under which man may be so entitled.

Then the next Act in the category is the 33 & 34 Vict. c. 28, which was passed in 1870. That was an Act in which the practice of all the ecclesiastical courts in the kingdom was thrown open to solicitors, and the penalties which existed at that time under the statute of 53 Geo. 3 were no longer applicable to persons who practise in all these ecclesiastical courts without being proctors; but in that Act the rights of the proctors in the provincial courts of Canterbury and York and the diocesan court of London were expressly excepted. I agree again with Mr. Cookson that that only goes as far as this—that, whereas before the year 1870 no one could practise in any of the ecclesiastical courts as a proctor without being properly admitted and enrolled, and would have to pay a penalty if he did, this Act enabled everybody to do so in all other courts, except this court and the court of York and the diocesan court of London.

So stands the matter on the general rights of the proctors. Then in 1858 came the institution of the Probate Court. That was the creation of a new court with new powers. The old jurisdiction of the Prerogative Court was handed over to it. The powers and jurisdiction of the court were very much enlarged, and although it was to some extent the transfer of the jurisdiction, it was much more largely the creation of a new jurisdiction. In that Act there is an express clause that the practice of the court should not be confined to proctors, but should be opened to solicitors; but in that Act there were express provisions that injuries done to the proctors should be admitted to compensation, and that compensation was given in consequence of their having in future to share their testamentary and matrimonial business with the great body of solicitors in the country. Two great Acts of Parliament were passed in the same session, and the provisions of the Probate were made applicable in the Divorce Act to matters of divorce as well. Therefore in 1858 the proctors lost a great portion of their monopoly—the matrimonial business and the testamentary business, by far the most lucrative portions of the proctors' practice—and they had in future to share that business with the profession at large; but they were given compensation.

In 1859 was passed the Admiralty Act, and it is a fair remark that on that occasion the Legislature did not think it ought to give compensation. If I am right in supposing that the compensation which the Treasury awarded on the Probate Act was limited to the testamentary and divorce department it would be a fair observation that in the subsequent year the proctors were stripped of their admiralty monopoly, although the compensation of the previous year had in no way extended to it. I rather think it was so. It stands, therefore, thus:—That in these two years the Legislature did throw open those courts, in the one case giving compensation, in the other not.

Then, under the Judicature Act, the Supreme Court received power to make general rules regulating its practice, and under that Act of Parliament made rules which admitted proctors, solicitors, and attorneys to practise *pari passu* in the court.

That is the history, then, of those legislative provisions with regard to proctors' rights. As I said just now, the result is that the business of the proctors has been from time to time invaded. Solicitors have been let into practice with them in first one court and then another, and that sometimes accompanied with compensation sometimes not, but in all cases it has been done under the direct authority of the Legislature. Now, matters so standing, I think it is very difficult to maintain that this court even has the power to do what is asked. Directly or indirectly it might do it by altering the provisions under which persons are permitted to practise, but the way in which the Legislature has done it has not by any means been by altering the conditions under which proctors should be admitted, but it has been said at once that, as a qualification for practice, it is not necessary that a man should be other than a solicitor, and I think it is very difficult under these circumstances to contend that this court could do the same.

But now I will come to the Judicature Act. The provisions of the Judicature Act are, I think, very intelligible. I do not say that the wording of this section might not be open to other construction, but I think the general

provision is obvious enough. We must recollect what the Judicature Act did. It infused as it were into one new court various existing courts of probate and divorce, common law and equity, and admiralty. Well, in the courts of common law attorneys practised, in the courts of equity solicitors practised, in the courts of probate attorneys and solicitors practised, in the court of divorce attorneys, solicitors, and proctors practised, and in the court of admiralty also solicitors and proctors practised. All these courts were drawn together into one court by the Act, and it would seem almost an obvious provision of such an Act that the various officers of the different courts should be also allowed, all of them, to practise indiscriminately in any branch of the new court. It would be especially necessary that there should be a provision of that kind when it is borne in mind that a part of the provisions of the Judicature Act, and a very material part in the judgment of those who framed it, is that on no occasion should a suitor be put to any difficulty or expense by reason of his having commenced his suit in any particular division of the court, which division of the court could not fully and adequately do justice in a particular suit, and consequently there was a provision that the various divisions should be able to act together, and that any matter arising in one of the divisions could be handed over to another. Under such circumstances, the keeping up of a separate body of men capable of practising in one of the divisions and not in others would be really an impossibility, and therefore I have no doubt the Master of the Rolls rightly interpreted the provision as being that a person who is capable of practising in any one of the courts which has been transferred to the High Court should be allowed to practise in any other. But what bearing has that upon a court which was in no way created by the Judicature Act, which lies outside it, in respect of which no such necessity exists? It appears to me that it only goes so far as to say this, that here is another instance in which it is shown that the policy of the Legislature is not to favour the existence of separate bodies of men practising in separate courts, but to throw open generally to the whole profession of the law the practice in all the courts. That is a very desirable policy, and I should not be in any way surprised, if this matter was brought before the Legislature, that they should decide that this court, like the others, should be thrown open, and it would then be for the Legislature, if they thought it right, to give compensation. Now, if I were to take the matter in hand, I could only do the wrong, and could not give compensation if I thought it was due. That consideration alone is sufficient, in my mind, to induce me to refuse to act in such a matter. The Legislature may think it right to give compensation, and they have the power. I have no power to give compensation. I do not know that it is not quite as much a matter of justice as in the case of the Probate Court—at any rate, I have no power to entertain the question one way or the other, and, therefore, I can only do half justice in the matter.

One word upon the subject of the policy of the matter. It must be borne in mind that the Judicature Act has assimilated the practice of the various courts, and it must be borne in mind that, as regards this court, the practice is wholly and totally different.

I have had some experience in the Courts of Probate and Divorce of the evils—I do not say they may not be compensated by benefits in an opposite direction, but of the evils of courts of that character in which the business is limited, and in which, therefore, there is not a general opportunity for the whole mass of the profession to inform themselves—of the evils of men practising in a court who are utterly unacquainted with the practice, which leads very often to a great loss of money on the part of the suitor, which is thrown away from the want of technical skill and knowledge which are to be obtained only by experience on the part of those who act for the suitors. That, however, may be, and perhaps is, compensated by benefits in the opposite direction. We all know that monopolies and close bodies of men are evils of themselves, and lead to expense in many ways. There may be a good deal to be said on the policy of throwing open to the whole body of the profession the very small amount of business which belongs to this court, in which the practice at present is in so totally different a state to the practice in other courts

of the kingdom, and although I hope that the time will come when the powers of the court will be sufficient to improve that practice, and in a great measure to assimilate it to the practice of other courts, I feel that there would be a great deal to be said, as the matter now stands, on the policy of throwing this court open, if I had the power to do so. Under all the circumstances of the case, however, I think I must refuse the application.

General Correspondence.

THE PROCTORS' MONOPOLY IN THE COURT OF ARCHES.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—You have already shortly noticed the recent case of *Crisp v. Martin*, and it is, therefore, only necessary to premise that the application of Mr. Gedge, the respondent's solicitor, to conduct his client's case in the Court of Arches, was supported by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, who are of opinion that the time has fully arrived for throwing open that court to the profession generally.

Under the Judicature Act, the proctors, who did not eighteen years ago, under the Probate Act, qualify for the purpose, are to be called, and, by the decision of the Master of the Rolls, may become, solicitors of the Supreme Court; but Lord Penzance has refused to make an order for the admission of solicitors to the Court of Arches (which would give the solicitors a reciprocal advantage), and he grounded his refusal mainly on the fact that he is not able to give compensation to the proctors, which the Legislature might see fit to do.

His lordship has made one or two observations in his judgment which fairly call for some remarks.

He speaks of "the evils of men practising in a court who are utterly unacquainted with the practice, which leads very often to a great loss of money on the part of the suitor, which is thrown away from the want of technical skill and knowledge, which is to be obtained only by experience, on the part of those who act for the suitors; but (he continues) that may be, and perhaps is, compensated by benefits in the opposite direction. We all know that monopolies and close bodies of men are evils of themselves, and lead to expense in many ways."

Now, Sir, although one can enter into the learned judge's view that he might be doing an injustice on the score of compensation, I must take leave to make the following remarks as to the "policy" of the matter.

By the Judicature Act all proctors are admitted to practise in every division of the Supreme Court without passing the two legal examinations of fitness. Surely, therefore, the solicitors should now be let into the business that remains to the Court of Arches, which is really only one-third of the business of an intermediate appeal court. Solicitors are already empowered to transact their clients' business under the Public Worship Act in that court, and they can also, and do, conduct their clients' business in the ecclesiastical courts of first instance, and before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the ultimate court of appeal—consequently, it is a hardship and inconvenience, both to the client and solicitor, to have the case change hands in transitu.

Again—and this is of the essence of the question—no new proctors are articled or admitted, and their number has been rapidly decreasing for eighteen years, and they obtain partners and successors entirely from the solicitor branch.

The Legislature has already recognized this fact, when starting the country with a new and uniform system, by abolishing the name of proctor, and causing them to be called solicitors, the only recognized practitioners in the Supreme Court of Judicature; and it, therefore, surely follows that the latter should now be able to represent their clients, whether as plaintiffs or defendants, appellants or respondents, in every tribunal of the kingdom?

S. S. C.

COUNTRY SALES BY AUCTION.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir.—Will you allow me, through your columns, to direct attention to the practice, in the case of country sales, of providing liquor for the use of the parties attending them? I was present a few days since at a sale in one of the Midland counties in which my firm were concerned for the vendors, and which was held at the principal hotel in the town. There were, I should think, about forty-five persons present, and at the conclusion of the sale the landlord brought in his bill, the items in which, so far as related to the sale, were as follows:—

	£ s. d.
11 Bottles Sherry, 5s.	2 15 0
23 " Port, 6s.	6 18 0
Brandy and Biscuits	0 4 0
	£9 17 0

I am informed that thirty-four bottles of wine is rather a moderate consumption, and I therefore make no complaint on that point; but the whole system seems to me objectionable on every ground. So far as I could see, and as one would naturally expect, the wine was hardly touched by persons who had come with the intention of bidding, but was consumed by parties who had evidently attended the sale simply for the sake of the wine. One of these had made such good use of his time that when I left the auction-room he was leaning on the table in a state of intoxication.

E. E. L.

Lincoln's-inn, May 1.

Notes.

ON MONDAY, May 1, in a case of *Re Lewis*, the Chief Judge held that notice of an application for an order to continue an *interim injunction* restraining the proceedings in an action against a debtor who has filed a liquidation petition may be served by post. This appears to be in strict accordance with r. 14 of 1870, which says that "All notices and other proceedings, for the delivery of which no special mode is prescribed, may be sent by prepaid post letter to the last known address of the person to be served therewith." In some cases, such as service of a debtor's summons and a bankruptcy petition (see rr. 59, 60), and service of notice of an application to commit for contempt (r. 179), personal service is expressly required. But there appears to be no special provision with regard to the service of notice of motion to continue an *interim injunction*, and the decision is worthy of being noted only because it overrules a decision of Mr. Registrar Murray as Chief Judge in *Re Verner* (15 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 697).

AN APPLICATION made to the Court of Appeal on Thursday, May 4, affords an instance of the inconveniences which result from the absence of a judge of the Chancery Division from his own court for the purpose of sitting in the Court of Appeal. During the first four days of this week the Master of the Rolls has been presiding in the division of the Court of Appeal which has been sitting at Westminster. On Thursday, in a case of *Glover v. The Greenbank Alkali Company*, an action which is attached to the Rolls Court, Fischer, Q.C., applied to the division of the Court of Appeal which was sitting in Lincoln's-inn for a direction that an affidavit might be filed. Owing to a defect in the jurat the affidavit could not be filed without an order of the court, and it was desired to use the affidavit upon the hearing of a motion at the Rolls on Friday. The court (James, L.J., Baggallay, J.A., and Lush, J.) said that they had no jurisdiction to make the order asked for, they having only an appellate jurisdiction, and not being judges of the High Court. The application could, however, be made to the Master of the Rolls at Westminster. Ultimately, Mr. Justice Lush suggested that either of the Vice-Chancellors, being a judge of the High Court, would be able to make the order, and recommended that the application should be made in that way.

THE SUPREME COURT OF KANSAS, says the *Albany Law Journal*, in *Davenport v. Ogg*, has decided an interesting question as to the effect of the disobedience of a witness to an order to retire from the court-room pending the taking of testimony of other witnesses. At the commencement of the trial in this case, an order was made by the court below excluding from the court-room during the trial all the plaintiff's witnesses, except such witnesses as might be called in at any time for examination. During the trial, one of the plaintiff's witnesses came into the court-room, in violation of the order, and heard all the evidence in chief of another witness of the plaintiff. Afterwards the plaintiff offered to introduce this witness, but the defendant objected on the ground that he had violated the order. The testimony of the witness was excluded solely on the ground of disobedience to the order. But the Supreme Court held that this was error; that the testimony of the witness should have been received, and should have been allowed to go to the jury; but that the conduct of the witness might also have been shown to the jury for the purpose of affecting his credibility. In 2 Phillips on Ev., 5th Am. ed., 744, it is said: "If a witness, who has been ordered to withdraw, continues in court, it was formerly considered to be in the judge's discretion whether or not the witness should be examined. But it may be considered as settled, that the circumstance of a witness having remained in court in disobedience to an order of withdrawal, is not a ground for rejecting his evidence, and that it merely affords matter of observation."

Appointments, &c.

MR. ROBERT BERRY, advocate, has been appointed Secretary to the Royal Commission on the Scotch Universities. Mr. Berry was called to the Scotch bar in 1863, and is Professor of Roman Law and the Law of Scotland in the University of Glasgow.

MR. JAMES HENRY SPRING BRANSON, barrister, of Madras, has been appointed to act as First Judge of the Madras Small Causes Court during the absence of Mr. Thomas Mortimer Busteed. Mr. Branson was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1862.

MR. LOVELL BURCHETT CLARENCE, deputy Queen's Advocate in Ceylon, has been appointed a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of that Island. Mr. Clarence was educated at Milton Abbas School and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a senior optime in 1861. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1864, and formerly practised as an equity draftsman and conveyancer. He was appointed deputy Queen's Advocate of Ceylon in 1873.

MR. GEORGE RUTTER FLETCHER (of the firm of Fletcher, Paul, & Co.) solicitor, of 11, Staple-inn, has been elected Vestry Clerk of the Parish of St. Peter, Saffron-hill, in the place of Mr. Charles Hanslip, resigned.

MR. WALTER FURLEY, solicitor, of Canterbury, has been appointed Registrar of the Canterbury County Court (Circuit No. 49), in the place of his partner, Mr. John Callaway, who has resigned. Mr. Furley was admitted a solicitor in 1863.

MR. FREDERICK ROBERT HOWELL, solicitor, of Aberdare, has been appointed Registrar of the Aberdare County Court (Circuit No. 30), in succession to Mr. Isaac Davies Rees. Mr. Howell was admitted a solicitor in 1871.

MR. GEORGE WARNER LAWTON, solicitor (of the firm of Lawton & Warne), has been appointed a Magistrate of the Borough of Eye. Mr. Lawton was admitted a solicitor in 1829, and has several times served the office of mayor of the borough.

MR. B. H. VAN TROMP, of Inverness-terrace, Hyde-park, and Essex-street, Strand, solicitor and parliamentary agent, has been unanimously elected Clerk to the Vestry of the Royal Precinct of the Savoy, and to the Ecclesiastical Governing Body attached thereto.

We regret to learn that Mr. Justice Quain is still seriously ill.

Obituary.

MR. WILLIAM PEARCE.

Mr. William Pearce, barrister-at-law, died at his residence, Raven Lodge, Norbiton, Kingston, on the 2nd inst., at the age of fifty-three, after a long illness. Mr. Pearce was the son of the late Mr. John Pearce, and was born in 1823. He was educated at Tunbridge School, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1852. He was a member of the Home Circuit and Essex Sessions, and had at one time a very good *Nisi Prius* business, and often held leading briefs, but the failure of his health had for some time caused his practice to fall off. Though without any pretensions to eloquence, Mr. Pearce was a very discreet and effective advocate, being possessed of great tact, a persuasive manner, and imperturbable good humour. In criminal business he was especially successful, and was long the acknowledged leader of the Essex Sessions. He had a considerable county court practice, chiefly in Essex and Surrey, and sometimes sat as deputy-judge for Mr. Stenor in the latter county. Mr. Pearce was a man of very robust frame and active habits, but his health suddenly failed about two years ago, and though he struggled against his illness with great fortitude, the change in his appearance was most painful to witness. He was engaged in business at Westminster up to the latter part of the Hilary Sittings. Mr. Pearce's death has caused much regret to his friends, owing to the geniality of his disposition, and the kindness and consideration which he always evinced towards the younger members of the profession. He was buried at the Kingston Cemetery.

MR. JOHN REES.

Mr. John Rees, solicitor, many years a member of one of the largest legal firms in London, died at his residence, 81, Holland-road, Kensington, on the 19th inst., in his ninetieth year. Mr. Rees was born in 1787, and was admitted a solicitor in 1816. He practised for a short time at 1, Warwick-square, but soon afterwards removed to 21, College-hill, where he went into partnership with Mr. Edward Archer Wilde, brother of the late Lord Truro (who had himself been a member of the same firm) and father of Lord Penzance, and with the late Mr. Mark Beauchamp Peacock. On Mr. Peacock's appointment the firm was joined by Mr. George Humphry, and at a later period by Mr. Charles Norris Wilde. Mr. Rees' professional experience was very wide, his firm having been at various periods advisers to the College of Surgeons, the South-Eastern Railway Company, the Imperial Gas Company, and to other important commercial bodies. Mr. Rees was very highly esteemed in the profession, and his advice was greatly valued by a large body of clients. About eight years ago, after a professional career of more than half a century, he withdrew from the firm, and ceased to practise. His son, Mr. John Charles Rees, was admitted a solicitor in 1851, and was for several years law clerk to the South-Eastern Railway Company, but now practises as a parliamentary agent in Great George-street, Westminster.

MR. THOMAS HOLT.

Mr. Thomas Holt, solicitor and notary, died at The Elms, Gloucester, on the 19th inst., in his eighty-first year. The deceased was a native of Northampton, and was born in 1796. He was admitted a solicitor in 1831, and soon afterwards settled at Gloucester, being appointed by the late Bishop Monk as his secretary. In the following year he was also made deputy-registrar of the ancient diocese of Gloucester, and on the death of Mr. Thomas Gardiner he became chief registrar, both of the diocese and of the arch-deaconry of Bristol. He enjoyed the confidence of five successive bishops, and was greatly esteemed by all sections of the clergy of the diocese, who, on his resignation of the office of bishop's secretary, about ten years ago, presented him with an address expressive of their regret at the severance of his connection with them. Since the passing of the Probate Act he had been district registrar for Gloucester, and he was a perpetual commissioner for Gloucestershire, and one of the trustees of the city charities,

and the grammar school. Mr. Holt's strength had long been failing, and about a month ago he had resigned the registrarship of the diocese.

MR. THOMAS COOMBS.

Mr. Thomas Coombs, solicitor, died at Dorchester, on Sunday, the 30th ult., at the age of fifty-seven. The deceased was the son of the late Mr. Thomas Coombs, solicitor, of Dorchester, and was born in 1819. He was admitted a solicitor in 1840, and immediately went into practice with his father, whom he succeeded, about thirty years ago, in the office of clerk to the county magistrates at Dorchester. He was also clerk to the Dorchester Highway Board, and acting-under-sheriff of the county; a member of the Incorporated Law Society, the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and the Justices' Clerks' Society; a commissioner for oaths in all the divisions of the High Court, and a perpetual commissioner for Dorsetshire. Mr. Coombs had for many years been captain of the Dorchester Rifle Volunteers, in which corps he took the warmest interest; and he was an influential member of the Masonic body, being provincial grand secretary for Dorsetshire. He had been for many years an alderman, and had twice served the office of Mayor of Dorchester; he was also chairman of the gas company, a feoffee of the Grammar School, and an auditor of the county hospital. Mr. Coombs was the local Conservative agent, and had taken an active part in many borough and county contests. He leaves a widow and three children.

MR. GEORGE WINN, JUN.

Mr. George Winn, jun., solicitor, of Askrigg, was drowned in the River Ure, on the night of Saturday, the 22nd ult. He was driving home in a dog cart, and had to cross the river at a shallow place near Aysgarth, and it is supposed that he missed the ford, and was upset and carried away by the current. His body was discovered on the following morning. The deceased was the eldest son of Mr. George Winn, solicitor. He was admitted in 1862, and practised in partnership with his father both at Askrigg and at Hawes. He was a commissioner for taking affidavits in the High Court, and a perpetual commissioner for the North and West Ridings of Yorkshire, and he held the offices of clerk to the Askrigg Highway Board, and clerk and deputy-superintendent-registrar to the Aysgarth Union. Mr. Winn was not quite forty years of age.

MR. CHARLES DELAUNEY TURNER BRAVO.

Mr. Charles Delauney Turner Bravo, barrister, died at his residence, The Priory, Balham, on the 19th ult. The deceased was the son of Mr. Joseph Bravo, of 2, Palace-green, Kensington, and graduated at Trinity College, Oxford. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1870, and was a member of the Home Circuit, practising also at the Surrey Sessions and in the Lord Mayor's Court. He was for several months one of the staff of the *WEEKLY REPORTER* for the Probate and Divorce Court. Mr. Bravo's early death has caused much grief to his friends. He had only recently been married.

The forty-fourth anniversary dinner of the United Law Clerks' Society is fixed for Monday, the 29th inst., and by permission of the Benchers of the Middle Temple it will be held in their hall. The Right Hon. Sir George Jessel, the Master of the Rolls, has consented to preside. The music will be under the direction of Mr. Hopkins, organist of the Temple Church, assisted by Mr. Lewis Thomas, Mr. Coates, and the members of the choir.

At the meeting of the Parliamentary Committee on Ecclesiastical Dilapidations on Monday, Mr. Hodge, solicitor, of Newport, Shropshire, said there were very general complaints as to the working of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, more especially as to the inflexibility of the surveyors sent to report, and who did so without reference to the circumstances of the living. The hardship was felt in the case of small livings with large vicarages, for in many cases the stipends were utterly inadequate to keep up the repairs.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society at the Law Institution on Tuesday, the 2nd inst., some two hours were spent in discussing matters affecting the working of the society, and the remainder of the evening in considering whether a petition should be presented to Parliament in favour of Lord Selborne's Bill. No decision was, however, come to upon the point when the proceedings terminated according to the rules at ten o'clock. Thirty-five members were present. The question for discussion on Tuesday evening next is upon the subject of the Queen's new title.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the directors was held at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 4th inst., the following being present, viz., Mr. Desborough (chairman), and Messrs. Burgess, Carpenter, Collisson, Drew, Kelly, Lovell, Masterman, Scadding, Sidney Smith, and Boodle (secretary). A grant of £10 was made to the daughter of a deceased non-member, the report of the directors to be made to the annual general court to be held on the 18th inst. was considered and approved, and the general business of the association was transacted.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVON-PORT LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at the Athenaeum, Plymouth, on Friday last, James Lye Esq., in the chair. The subject for the evening's discussion was as follows:—"A railway company, upon purchasing land, covenants not to build upon it above a certain height. The covenant comes to interfere with an extension of the works of the company under the powers of their Act, which would be for the public advantage. Can the landowner obtain an injunction against the breach of the covenant?" Messrs. E. F. Fox and M. Guy spoke for the affirmative, and Mr. C. France for the negative. Before the question was put to the vote, it was considered desirable to add to it the words "assuming damages not to be a sufficient compensation," and, as amended, it was carried in favour of the affirmative by a majority of two.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday last the subject for the evening's debate being, "That it is expedient to abolish the system of unpaid magistracy." Mr. A. J. Parker opposed the motion. Several other members spoke for and against the motion, and it was ultimately lost by a majority of one in a meeting of twenty-seven.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

May 1.—INNS OF COURT.

This Bill was read a second time.

GENERAL SCHOOL OF LAW.

Lord SELBORNE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that it was not the same as the Bill with a similar title which was before their lordships last session. The letter measure was read a second time, but owing to objections taken to it by his noble and learned friend on the woolack it was not carried to the further stages. To meet his noble and learned friend's objections, he had confined the General School of Law Bill now on the paper to a scheme for a system of examination of law students. The school was to be an examining, but not a teaching, body.—The Bill was, read a second time.

IRISH PEERAGE.

The House went into committee on this Bill.

On clause 1, certain verbal amendments were made.

On clause 2, which provided that the number of lords temporal of Ireland elected for life to sit and vote in the

House of Lords should be increased from twenty-eight to thirty-two, a verbal amendment was made, but the clause as amended was negatived, with the understanding that it would be brought up on the report.

Clauses 3, 4, and 5 were negatived.

Clause 6 was agreed to, and the Bill passed through committee.

MAY 2.—UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

On the report of the amendments on this Bill, the Marquis of SALISBURY moved an amendment to bring the headships of the colleges within the action of the commissioners, and further proposed to insert words giving power to the commissioners to make provision for religious instruction.—The amendments were agreed to.

The Marquis of SALISBURY proposed a new sub-section in section 16, the object of which was to empower the commissioners to determine the age after which the holder of a fellowship not attached to any office in the college or in the university should take part in the government of the college.—The motion was withdrawn.

The Earl of MORLEY proposed to insert, after clause 17, a new clause, giving the commissioners power, with the consent of two-thirds of the governing body of Oriel College, to make a severance from the provostship of the said college of the canonry of Rochester.—The motion was withdrawn.

The Marquis of SALISBURY proposed, after clause 19, to insert this clause:—"The commissioners, in statutes made by them, shall make provision (1) for the form of accounts of the university and of a college and hall relating to funds administered either for general purposes or in trust, and for the audit thereof; (2) for the publication of accounts of receipts and expenditure of money raised under the borrowing powers of the university or of a college or hall." The clause was agreed to.

The Marquis of SALISBURY proposed the following clause:—"The commissioners, in statutes made by them, may make provision for the complete or partial union of two or more colleges, or of a college and a hall, provided application in that behalf is made to the commissioners on the part of the colleges, or colleges and hall, in the case of a college, by resolution passed at a general meeting of the college specially summoned for this purpose by the votes of not less than two-thirds of the number of persons present and voting, with the consent in writing of the visitor of the college; and in the case of a hall, by a resolution of the Hebdomadal Council, with the consent in writing of the visitor and principal of the hall."—The clause was agreed to.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN moved an amendment having for its object to provide that the commissioners should take into consideration any representation made to them by the governing body of a school or by the Charity Commissioners in respect of a proposed statute for such school.—The amendment was withdrawn.

The Marquis of SALISBURY moved the following provision at the end of clause 27:—"If the universities committee report their opinion that a statute referred to them ought to be remitted to the commissioners with a declaration, it shall be lawful for the Queen in Council to remit the same accordingly; and the commissioners shall reconsider the statute, with the declaration, and the statute, if and as modified by the commissioners, shall be proceeded on as an original statute is proceeded on, and so from time to time."—The motion was agreed to.

Some minor amendments proposed by the Marquis of SALISBURY were also inserted, and the report was then received.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 27.—MERCHANT SHIPPING.

The House again went into committee on this Bill. Clause 16 was postponed.

On clause 17 (marking of deck lines), Mr. PLIMSOUL moved an amendment for the purpose of extending the clause to our coasting trade as well to foreign-going vessels.—Ultimately the clause was amended so that the marking of deck lines was made to apply to "every British ship (except ships under 80 tons register employed solely in the coasting trade, ships employed solely in fishing, and all pleasure-yachts)."—Clause 17 as thus amended was agreed to.

On clause 18 (marking of load-line), Mr. PLIMSOLL moved to insert after "ships" the words "under 80 tons register."—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. E. SMITH moved to insert words exempting "billyboys," a class of small vessels used in Scotland.—On a division the amendment was lost by 237 to 66.—Mr. NORWOOD moved to substitute for "intends" the words "claims to be entitled with safety," in reference to the owner's maximum load-line.—The amendment was negatived.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved an amendment to the effect that the owner's statement of the distance between the load-line and the decks of his vessel should be transmitted to the Board of Trade.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 197 to 64, and progress was reported.

PIER AND HARBOUR ORDERS CONFIRMATION (ALDBOROUGH, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NOS. 2 AND 3).
These Bills were read a third time.

COUNTY RATES (IRELAND).

Mr. BUTT introduced a Bill to make provision for the better apportionment of county rates between landlord and tenant in Ireland.

April 28.—MERCHANT SHIPPING.

The House again went into committee on this Bill.

Clause 18 (marking the load-line), as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 19 (penalty for offences in relation to marks on ships), Mr. GRIEVE moved to amend the clause by the insertion of the word "wilfully" before "neglect."—The amendment was negatived.—Mr. E. JENKINS (in the absence of Mr. Plimsoll) moved in page 11, line 8, after "marked," to insert "or who allows the ship to be so loaded as to submerge the centre of the disc."—The amendment was agreed to.—The clause, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 20 was agreed to.

On clause 21, Mr. RATHBONE moved to insert words providing that where an investigation might involve the suspension of the certificate of a master or mate, one of the assessors shall, where practicable, have had experience in the merchant service.—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. WILSON moved the insertion of the words "and in the absence of any such charge no master or officer shall be required to give up his certificate."—On a division the clause was rejected by 147 to 66.—The clause was then agreed to, as were also clauses 22 and 23.

Progress was then reported.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENSING LAW AMENDMENT).

Sir H. JOHNSTONE moved the second reading of this Bill, which, he said, was intended to prevent the unlimited sale of spirits, but the debate was adjourned.

May 1.—MERCHANT SHIPPING.

The House again went into committee on this Bill.

Clauses 24 and 25 were withdrawn.

On clause 26, which related to the enforced detention of ships, Mr. BRASSEY moved an amendment to the effect that the master or owner of any ship proceeding to sea before being released by competent authority should be liable to pay her Majesty a penalty not exceeding £100.—The amendment was agreed to.—Some verbal amendments were also agreed to, and the clause as amended was added to the Bill.

On clause 27, which relates to the registration of the owners or managing owners of ships, Sir H. HOLLAND moved the insertion of words to provide that the managing owner whose name was registered should be resident in the United Kingdom, and should be either sole or part owner of the ship; and where there was no such managing owner, the name of some one person resident in the United Kingdom should be registered.—The amendment was agreed to.—Sir H. HOLLAND next moved an amendment to provide that any person registered in accordance with the concluding words of his previous amendment should, for the purposes of the Act, be deemed to be the managing owner, and that in the event of a ship leaving a port in the United Kingdom without such registration having been effected the owner of the ship, or, if there were two or more owners, each owner should be liable

to a penalty not exceeding £100.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved to amend the proposed amendment by substituting for the latter portion of it the words, "if default is made in complying with this section the ship may be detained until it has been complied with," but he afterwards withdrew this amendment and the original amendment was agreed to.—The clause, as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 28 (fees, salaries, and costs)—Mr. GOURLEY moved to leave out the word "continue" in the sixth line.—The amendment was negatived, and the clause as amended was agreed to.

Clause 29 (legal proceedings in cases of offences) was also agreed to.

On clause 30 (application to Scotland), the LORD ADVOCATE moved the insertion of the following words:—"The provision with respect to a prosecution not being instituted except by or with the consent of the Board of Trade shall not apply." He explained that all prosecutions in Scotland would be at the instance of the Lord-Advocate and under his direction; they would originate with him.—The proviso was agreed to, and the clause as amended was added to the Bill.

Clause 31 was also agreed to.

On clause 32 (page 15, line 32, on the motion of Sir C. ADDERLEY, the word "passing" was left out, and the word "commencement" substituted).

Clause 16 (entry of deck cargo in official log) was negatived.—Sir C. ADDERLEY moved, page 1, after clause 2, to insert the following clause:—"This Act shall come into operation on the 1st day of October, 1876 (which day is in this Act referred to as the commencement of this Act)."—The clause was added to the Bill.

Sir C. ADDERLEY then moved, after clause 23, to insert the following clause relating to the place of investigation:—"A formal investigation into a shipping casualty may be held at any place appointed in that behalf by the Board of Trade, and all enactments relating to the authority holding the investigation shall, for the purpose of the investigation, have effect as if the place so appointed were a place appointed for the exercise of ordinary jurisdiction of that authority."—The clause was added to the Bill.

Sir C. ADDERLEY moved to insert after clause 31, a clause extending the operation of the Act to the Isle of Man.—The clause was added to the Bill.

Sir C. ADDERLEY moved a new clause dealing with the deck loading of timber. It provided that during the winter months a ship, British or foreign, arriving at any port in the United Kingdom should not, while subject to British jurisdiction, carry upon or above any part of the upper deck any heavy timber as cargo or any light timber to a height exceeding three feet above the deck, under a penalty of £5 for every cubic foot of timber so carried; the penalties not to exceed £100, and to be recovered on summary jurisdiction, the clause not to apply to any ship putting into port through stress of weather or for repairs.—The clause, having been amended so as to come into operation on the 1st of January, 1877, was added to the Bill.

Mr. E. SMITH moved the omission of the words prohibiting the carriage of "any pitch pine, mahogany, or other heavy wood," the effect of which would be to allow a ship to carry on deck "any timber of any description to a height not exceeding three feet."—The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. E. SMITH moved to insert words allowing "deals or battens" to be carried like timber.—The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLIMSOLL moved the omission of the words "to a height exceeding three feet," with a view of inserting the word "on."—The amendment on a division was rejected by 142 to 134.

Mr. PLIMSOLL then moved to omit the words "if he is privy to the offence."—Mr. RUSSELL GURNERY suggested the omission of the words "if he is privy to the offence," and the substitution of the words "unless such owner shall show that he was not privy to the offence."—Mr. PLIMSOLL accepted the suggestion; and his amendment was withdrawn and this substituted for it.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 199 to 104.

Mr. NORWOOD proposed an amendment to the effect that the form of penalty should be changed to a dock or port charge.—The amendment was negatived, and the clause was added to the Bill.

Sir C. ADDERLEY moved a clause to submit foreign ships to the provisions of the 5th clause as to detention for over-loading. This clause proposed that, as soon as the pro-

visional order for detention of a foreign ship was made, notice was to be given to the consul of the nation to which the ship belonged, and if the foreigner disputed the order then reference was to be made to the consul, who would name a competent surveyor to decide between the master and the Board of Trade.—The clause was added to the Bill.

SALMON FISHERIES.

This Bill passed through committee.

May 2.—IRISH TENANT RIGHT.

Mr. MULHOLLAND moved the second reading of this Bill, but the House was counted out.

May 3.—REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND).

Mr. MELDON moved the second reading of this Bill, which he explained extended to Ireland the provisions of 28 & 29 Vict. c. 36.—On a division the Bill was rejected by 235 to 168.

TRADES UNION ACT (1871) AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a third time.

SALMON FISHERIES.

This Bill was read a third time.

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND).

Mr. GIBSON introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to public records in Ireland.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (IRELAND).

Mr. GIBSON introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to legal practitioners in Ireland.

Courts.

COUNTY COURTS.

MACCLESFIELD.

(Before JOSEPH ST. JOHN YATES, Esq., Judge.)

April 13.—*Consols Insurance Association.*

Ex parte Peter Massey.

Conflicting orders of High Court and Court of Bankruptcy.

This was a motion by the trustee to make absolute an *interim* order restraining the Sheriff of Cheshire, and Mr. Pookes Royle, his officer, from proceeding under a writ of *f. fa.* lodged with the sheriff on the 9th of March. It appeared that after the seizure the debtor's property was claimed under a bill of sale by a Mrs. Bullock, of Macclesfield, and on the 16th the sheriff took out an interpleader summons in the Chancery Division of the High Court. On the 17th, the debtor filed his petition for liquidation. A receiver was appointed, and on the 20th notice of an application to restrain was served upon the sheriff, and at the hearing the deputy-registrar, Mr. William Mair, reserved his decision until the 29th. In the meantime, the interpleader had been several times before the court, and finally, on the 28th, the Master of the Rolls made an order that the sheriff should sell forthwith, and pay the proceeds, after deducting his costs, into the Chancery Division of the High Court; and on the following day the deputy-registrar made an *interim* order restraining the sheriff from proceeding until the 6th of April. The sheriff advertised the sale under the order of the Master of the Rolls to take place on that day, but before the sale took place the deputy-registrar again restrained the sheriff until the 13th of April, and this was the order sought to be made absolute.

Smyly, for the trustee.

Yates, for the sheriff and his officer.

Proctor (solicitor), for the execution creditor.

It was contended on behalf of the trustee that as the creditors at the first meeting, held on the 5th of April, had passed resolutions for liquidation, and the writ of *f. fa.* being over £50, the property seized passed to the trustee, and ought to have been given up by the sheriff when the resolutions were registered on the 6th, notwithstanding the order of the Master of the Rolls. For the sheriff it was contended that he had no option but to retain possession of the property until the court ordered him to withdraw, as he was liable to attachment if he disobeyed the order of the Master of the Rolls, and liable to be committed if he disobeyed the order of the Court of Bankruptcy, the two orders being in direct conflict, and if the court directed him to withdraw from possession the sheriff was entitled to his costs.

His Honour.—The sheriff has rightly kept possession of the property, but he must now withdraw, and the trustee must pay the sheriff's costs under the *f. fa.*, and also his costs in the application; the execution creditor's costs of appearing must also be paid by the trustee.

Solicitor for the trustee, *Hand*, Macclesfield.

Solicitor for the sheriff, *Tatlock*, Chester.

SERVICE OF ENGLISH WRITS IN IRELAND AND SCOTLAND.

ON Tuesday afternoon a large and important deputation from Ireland and Scotland waited upon the Home Secretary and the Lord Advocate, at the Home Office, to make a representation on the subject of the power to give leave to serve writs on defendants resident in Ireland and Scotland as exercised by the judges under the Judicature Acts.

Mr. McCarthy Downing, M.P., and Mr. McLaren, M.P., having introduced the deputation,

Mr. DILLON, on behalf of the Irish Incorporated Law Society, stated that this was a question which deeply affected his profession, and, indeed, the whole commercial and municipal interests of the country. He believed he was justified in saying that the Act under consideration did not contain a single word regarding either Ireland or Scotland, and that the orders which were made part of the Act, and which conferred upon the judges sitting at Westminster jurisdiction in Irish and Scotch causes, were made at the command of those judges. There was no express legislation for the power which was assumed by implication and construction of the Judicature Acts, and the result was that the jurisdiction of the Irish and Scotch courts was taken away, as well as the right of the people to be sued and defended in their own country and according to their own legal procedure. The whole population of Ireland felt this to be a great grievance.

Mr. HARRISON, on behalf of the Merchant Company of Edinburgh, which comprises 1,300 members, said the merchants of Scotland considered the procedure under the Judicature Act unnecessary and liable to be oppressive. Even after judgment had been given at Westminster, there would be as much expense incurred in getting it recorded as would have been incurred in getting a judgment direct in Scotland.

Other gentlemen having spoken,

Mr. MELDON, M.P., who recently introduced a Bill intended to remedy the evil complained of, said this question was fully discussed in the House of Commons last session on a Bill introduced to amend the English Common Law Procedure Acts with regard to foreign corporations, and an exception was expressly made in the case of Ireland and Scotland. Under these circumstances it was hoped that the Government would object to the judges at Westminster assuming jurisdiction under the Act of last year which was not conferred upon them by the Act of 1873.

The HOME SECRETARY.—You have put your case very clearly before us. Indeed, it lies in a nutshell. Is it your opinion that the Act confers absolute jurisdiction, or is it only a question of limit?

Mr. MELDON.—It is an absolute question of jurisdiction.

The HOME SECRETARY.—There is one question on which you have not touched—namely, the question of reciprocity.

Mr. DILLON.—That would be very illusory, so far as Ireland is concerned, because the great balance of trade is in favour of England and Scotland.

Mr. MCLAREN, M.P.—The whole of the municipal bodies in Scotland look upon reciprocity as being an additional evil.

The HOME SECRETARY.—I think I have got to the bottom of your views. Though this is a commercial question it is also a legal matter, and I cannot promise more than that I will consult with the Lord Chancellor on the subject.

The deputation then retired.

On Thursday about 100 Scotch and Irish members of Parliament waited upon the Lord Chancellor, in his official room at Westminster on the same subject.

Mr. MELDON, M.P., Mr. MCLAREN, M.P., and Mr. THORN, pointed out that it was never intended that jurisdiction should be given to the judges to compel defendants living in Scotland and Ireland to be brought to English courts. Great emphasis was put on the fact that the expenses of originating causes were much more in England than in either Scotland or Ireland.

The LORD CHANCELLOR in reply, said he would like to have

instances mentioned in which defendants had been brought from Scotland and Ireland to defend themselves in order that he might see whether the policy of the Act had been infringed. It was certainly only intended to apply where equity and justice required that a defendant should be brought to this country. It had always been the practice of the Court of Chancery, as long as he recollects, to serve out of the jurisdiction a process when that was necessary for the ends of justice. But the Court of Chancery always acted with the greatest care in order that no injustice should be done; and when the Judicature Act was passed the whole principle of that Act was to give this complete relief (which had been exercised in chancery so long) to the courts of common law. He agreed with the deputation, however, in thinking that the rule was too wide and not sufficiently guarded. These rules were not absolutely in his power. They could be altered by a majority of the judges with his concurrence, and then submitted to Parliament for approval, and this course he proposed to adopt in the present case.

GERMAN MARITIME LAW.

THE Federal Council of Germany has approved the draft of a Bill, framed by the Imperial Government, providing for the formation of courts of inquiry for accidents at sea. The text of the Bill has just been made public at Berlin. It is to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament. The preamble sets forth the necessity of the measure, with especial reference to the defects which have lately become apparent in the machinery for similar inquiries at present in operation in England. The preamble, moreover, affirms the competency of the imperial authorities to propose to enforce such a measure. The Bill itself comprises thirty clauses. It provides for the formation of the said courts of inquiry along the entire German seaboard. The cases to be referred to these courts are those in which either German or foreign vessels are concerned. The latter category is limited to accidents occurring in German territorial waters and to cases in which the German Chancellor expressly orders an inquiry. In the case of German vessels an inquiry is obligatory whenever a life has been lost or a ship has perished. Otherwise it is for the court itself to decide if an inquiry is desirable. In every inquiry it behoves the court to ascertain and proclaim the cause or causes which have led to the disaster. The court is further instructed to inquire into all the incidental occurrences and facts. Its chief attention is to be directed to the question whether the accident has arisen from any fault or neglect of the captain or helmsman, or any other officer of the vessel or vessels concerned, or else from defective construction of the vessel, from obstacles in the course of the ship, or from insufficiency of the apparatus and appliances provided for the saving of property and life. The courts are entitled to pronounce punishment against the guilty parties, and particularly to suspend captains and officers; but the Bill provides an appeal to a higher tribunal. The courts of first instance, whose mode of procedure is prescribed in detail in the Bill, are to be appointed by the particular State in whose territory their district is situated. They are to consist of boards of five members each, namely, one chairman versed in the law and four assessors conversant with nautical affairs, three of whom must be in possession of a master's certificate. Should any questions of competency arise between different courts in different States they are to be referred for decision to the Imperial Government. The procedure in the courts of inquiry is to be closely similar to the procedure in the jury courts. The court of appeal is to be an imperial tribunal, appointed jointly by the Emperor and the State Governments. The Emperor is to appoint the chairman and one nautical assessor. Each State Government is to appoint three members, of whom two must be conversant with nautical affairs. The appointments are for the space of three years. Whenever the meeting of the tribunal becomes needful the chairman is to convene a court of five members besides himself. The proceedings of such courts are to be public, and the decision is to go by majority of votes. The procedure is to be subsequently prescribed by the Federal Council.—*Morning Post.*

THE DECREASE OF CRIME.

LORD ABERDEAR recently gave the following interesting details of the course of crime in this country:—Between 1805 and 1841, while population had increased by 79 per cent., the increase of criminals was sixfold greater, viz., 482 per cent. The committals for indictable offences had, in 1842, reached 31,309. Although in 1847 the Juvenile Offenders Act was passed, enabling two magistrates to deal summarily with petty larcenies committed by youths under fifteen, that Act had produced no appreciable change in the number of criminals, which was, in fact, greater in 1848, the year which followed the Act, than in that in which it became law. We now, however, approach the portal of a brighter period. We have gained the summit level. A broad table-land has still to be crossed. The 14 years which follow between 1842 and 1855 inclusive represent this table-land. From the statistics of these years two decisive proofs may be drawn that the progress of crime had at length received a check. The first is that, although during that time the population of England and Wales had increased by 2,500,000, there was no increase in crime. In the seven years between 1842 and 1848 inclusive, the average number of committals was 27,947. In the following seven years, between 1849 and 1855 inclusive, the increase of population brought no increase of crime; the committals of each year averaged 27,499, or 448 less than the annual average of the seven preceding years. But this was not all; for, in the second place, while the number of committals was thus slightly reduced, the increased number of convictions testified to the more vigorous and successful administration of the law. In the first period of seven years the annual number of convictions had averaged 20,206; in the second, with a smaller number of committals, it had reached 21,398, an annual increase of 1,192. Concurrent with these improved results was a diminution in the severer sentences, showing, it may fairly be presumed, the decreasing number of the more atrocious crimes; for, while the sentences of transportation and penal servitude had, in the first period of seven years, averaged 3,727 annually, they had fallen in the second to 2,949, an average annual reduction of 778. I have chosen the year 1855 as a temporary halting-place, because in that year was passed the Criminal Justice Act, which enabled two justices to deal summarily with various minor larcenies, and which, therefore, introduced an element of disturbance into our judicial statistics when we endeavour to ascertain the relative progress of certain classes of crime. I will now compare the state of crime during the first and the last five of the 19 years which have elapsed since 1855, giving the annual average of committals and convictions, and showing how many were sentenced to imprisonment and how many to transportation or penal servitude:—1856–60—18,045 committals, 13,547 convictions, 10,988 imprisoned, 2,559 transportation or penal servitude. 1870–5—15,747 committals, 11,473 convictions, 9,848 imprisoned, 1,624 transportation or penal servitude. The year showing the smallest amount of criminals was 1873, in which there were 14,933 committals, 10,634 convictions, 9,141 imprisoned, and 1,483 penal servitude. In 1874 the numbers were increased—15,195 committals, 11,433 convictions, 9,793 imprisoned, 1,690 penal servitude. During this period of 19 years the increase of population has been 4,475,000. While there has been this vast increase of population, accompanied, be it remembered, not only by a proportionate augmentation of wealth, but by the ever-increasing aggregation of our population in large towns and districts already populous, a fact which has the most important bearing on the subject, you will observe that, comparing the first five years, from 1855 to 1860, with the last period from 1870 to 1875, the decrease in committals was 2,298; in convictions, 2,074; in sentences of imprisonment, 1,140; in sentences of penal servitude, 935. But the comparison is made with times in which a considerable improvement had already taken place, and, therefore, is very far indeed from representing the amount of progress effected as compared with a more distant period. In some particulars, however, the comparison with the remoter past can be easily and accurately made, and these are of importance, as showing how great has been the decrease in the graver descriptions of crime. In the year 1843, when our population was estimated

at 16,332,000, the numbers sentenced to transportation were 4,488. Thirty years later, when the population had increased to 23,104,000, or by 6,772,000, the numbers sentenced to the substituted and equivalent punishment of penal servitude were 1,493. Therefore, while the population had increased by 41·46 per cent., the most serious offences, short of murder, had decreased by 66·73 per cent. Let me anticipate the only objection which, I believe, can be urged against the fairness of this comparison. In 1864 there was passed an Act which raised the minimum of penal servitude sentences from three to five years, and enacted that, where any person previously convicted of felony should be sentenced to penal servitude, that sentence should be for not less than seven years. This statute probably had the effect of slightly reducing the number of penal servitude sentences, and increasing those of imprisonment. Yet the difference was hardly perceptible. The numbers sentenced to penal servitude were in 1862, 3,369; in 1863, 3,107; in 1864, 2,445; and in 1865, when the Act came into operation, the number was 2,081—a proportion of decrease not greater than in the preceding years. The sentences of imprisonment slightly increased in 1865, but soon resumed their downward progress, with occasional slight checks. I will venture to say without fear of refutation that the oldest judge now on the bench never knew a calendar so light in respect of numbers of prisoners as that of 1874, with the exception of the two years preceding it.

It is stated that in the Winslow extradition case, the American Government have determined to maintain the original position unchanged. The President, when Winslow is released in England, will communicate the correspondence to Congress for action.

Mr. Clare Read, M.P., speaking at the banquet on Tuesday evening at which a presentation was made to him, said of the Agricultural Holdings Act that the experience of the working of the Act justified the expression of Mr. John Howard, that it was not worth the paper on which it was printed.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

There has been no alteration in the Bank rate this week. The markets have been very much depressed until to-day, when a rally occurred, but still showing a considerable decline for the week, Consols, which are now at 96 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 96 $\frac{3}{4}$, alone showing an advance.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	140
Stock Caledonian	100	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	97
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	39
Stock Great Northern	100	128
Stock Do., A Stock*	100	130 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	107
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	122
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	115 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	31
Stock London and North-Western	100	141
Stock London and South Western	100	129
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	63
Stock Metropolitan	100	96 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock Do., District	100	44
Stock Midland	100	129 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock North British	100	93 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock North Eastern	100	150
Stock North London	100	159
Stock North Staffordshire	100	62
Stock South Devon	100	65
Stock South-Eastern	100	123

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '86, 107	Ditto, 5 per Cent., May, '78, 85 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto for Account	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 102 $\frac{1}{2}$	April, '84
Ditto, Ditto, Certificates —	Do., Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '78
Ditto Enforced Ppr., 5 per Cent. 85	Do., Bonds, per Cent. £1000
2d Nat. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. '73	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

2 per Cent. Consols, 96 $\frac{1}{2}$	Annuities, April, '85, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto for Account, June 1, 96 $\frac{1}{2}$	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1888
Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 95 $\frac{1}{2}$	Ex Bills, £1000, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per C. 10 pm:
New 3 per Cent., 95 $\frac{1}{2}$	Ditto, £500, Do., 10 pm.
Do. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent., Jan. '84	Ditto, £100 & £300, 10 pm.
Do. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent., Jan. '84	Bank of England Stock. — per
Do. 6 per Cent., Jan. '78	Ct. (last half-year), 353
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

BIRTHS AND MARRIAGES.

BIRTH.

STURTON.—April 25, at Holbeach, Lincolnshire, the wife of John Phipps Sturton, solicitor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

DAVIES—PARRY.—April 26, at Llanilar, Morris Davies, of Ffowrhdygaled, barrister-at-law, to Mary Anne Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late George Williams Parry, of Llidiad, Cardiganshire.

HAMLIN—GRAMMER.—April 27, at St. Saviour's, South Belgrave, William Thomas Hamlin, solicitor, of Staple Inn and Baywater, to Kate Jane, eldest daughter of Thomas Grammer, of Claverton-street, South Belgrave.

PRATT—DAVIES.—April 27, at the parish church, Pembridge, Herefordshire, Frederick Rogers Tidd Pratt, of Kington, Herefordshire, solicitor, son of the late John Tidd Pratt, barrister-at-law, Registrar of Friendly Societies in England, to Frances Marian, fourth daughter of the Rev. James Davies, of Moor Court, Prebendary of Hereford.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, April 28, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 26, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 6. Kimber, Queen et al, solicitor for the petitioner. Printing and Numerical Registering Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before May 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Augustus Cape, Old Jewry. Tuesday, June 13, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

TUESDAY, May 2, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Anglo-German Tunneling Company, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Wednesday, May 10, at 11, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

Coleshill Colliery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 14, directed to be heard V.C. Malone on Friday, May 12. Heritage, Nicholas Lane, solicitor for the petitioners.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Gleam.

TUESDAY, April 11, 1876.

Alchorne, Cardelia Sophia, Ultragombe, Devon. May 8. Nicholl and Co. Howard st, Strand

Beeton, James, Northampton, Publican. June 1. Becke and Green, Northampton

Bromfield, Samuel, Tattonhall, Cheshire, Esq. May 31. Brown and Rogers, Chester

Christenson, William, Liverpool, Bearhouse Keeper. April 25. Snowball and Co, Liverpool

Collins, John James, Brighton, Sussex, Gent. June 1. Beaumont and Son, Lincoln's Inn Fields

Cutler, Egerton Cotton, Windermere, Westmorland, Esq. June 10. Barnes and Bernard, Great Winchester st

Davison, Eleanor Thrap, Worcester. May 15. T. J. R. Davison, Plymlimon terrace, Priory Rd, Hastings

Davison, Mary, Worcester. May 15. T. J. R. Davison, Plymlimon terrace, Priory Rd, Hastings

Elli, Frederick, Brighton, Sussex, Chessemonger. May 13. Clarke and Howett, Brighton

Forster, John, Palace-gate House, Kensington, Esq. May 15. Farrar and Co, Lincoln's Inn Fields

Hole, William Henry, Wilmot, Cheshire, Gent. May 5. Earle and Co, Manchester

Holland, John, St. Mary's, Dorset, Esq. May 18. Tilford and Co, Old Jewry

Hornby, Hugh, Sandown, Wavertree, Lancashire, Merchant. June 24. Garnett and Co, Liverpool

Hunter, John, Nice, France, Esq. June 1. Peacock and Goddard, South square, Gray's Inn

Lancaster, Charles Croasdale, Evereesh, Somerset, Pensioner Ind. Govt. June 1. Nalder, Shepton Mallet

Mapescombe, Mary Ann, Bracknell, Berks. May 18. Roscoe and Co, King st, Finsbury square

Matthews, Samuel, Fenge, Surrey, Esq. May 20. Rutherford and Son, Gracechurch st

Moss, John, Myton crescent, Warwick, Domestic Servant. May 13. Dunning and Kay, Leeds

Muggleton, Samuel, Sittingbourne, Kent, Brick Maker. April 29. Hills, Sittingbourne
Pick, William, Waltham hill, York, Yeoman. May 13. Hirst and
Capes, Boroughbridge
Plucknett, Elizabeth, Rutland st, Hampstead rd. May 15. Tatham
and Co, Frederick's place, Old Jewry
Porley, Hannah, Bolstead, Suffolk. May 29. Aldous, Ipswich
Porley, John, Bolstead, Suffolk, Labourer. May 20. Aldous, Ipswich
Rennell, Eliza, Trafalgar square, Brompton. June 1. Keane, Lincoln's
inn fields
Talbot, Angelina, Bath, Somerset. June 1. Meads and Co, Bristol
Thackwell, Frederick, Cheltenham, Brick Maker. July 1. Babb and
Co, Cheltenham
Thompson, Rev Edwin, Vicarage, Wandsworth common. May 18.
Tillear and Co, Old Jewry
Tilley, Ann, Bristol. May 13. Perrin, Bristol
Van, Thomas, Walmer rd, Notting hill, Butcher. May 3. Rae,
Mincing lane
Walsh, William, Leeds, Painter. May 30. Markland and Davy,
Leeds
Walboner, Benjamin, Collingham, Nottingham, Farmer. May 29.
Tweed, Lincoln
Wilby, John, Northampton, Yeoman. June 7. Harvey, Leicester
Williams, John Bevan, Finchlingfield, Essex, Draper. June 16.
Hughes and Sons, Chapelst, Bedford row
Wilson, Thomas, Leeds, York. May 15. Newstead and Wilson, Leeds

FRIDAY, April 14, 1876.

Angell, Thomas, Downend, Gloucester, Farmer. June 1. Plummer,
Bristol
Barlow, Isabele Constance, Dalmere terrace, Paddington. July 11.
Bower and Cotton, Chancery lane
Clarkson, Thomas, Avenue rd, St John's wood, Printer. June 12.
Baily and Co, Berners st
Cordingley, Joseph, Cordingley Fold, Birstal, York, Gent. May 20.
Atkinson, Bradford
Day, Frederick Augustus Edwin, Bristol, Surgeon. May 20. Smith,
Weston-super-Mare
George, Emily, Bythorn, Huntingdon. May 20. Dent, Gray's inn
chambers
Grant, Sarah, Albert terrace, Regent's park. June 10. Taylor and
Co, Great James st, Bedford row
Lee, William, Kingston-upon-Hull, Keel Owner. April 18. Laverack,
County building, Hull
Lound, George, Sproatley, York. May 9. Watson and Son, Hull
McRaith, Alexander, South Shields, Durham, Draper. June 1. Blair,
South Shields
Meacock, James, Norwood. June 10. Houlder, Aldersgate st
Mortimer, John Roberts, Tregimis, Pembroke, Gent. May 31.
Mathias and Co, Haverfordwest
Moss, William, Bassingbourn, Cambridge, out of business. May 20.
Wortham, Royston, Herts
Needham, John Taylor, Sheffield, Cutlery Manufacturer. June 29.
Binney and Sons, Sheffield
Rees, Elizabeth, Tredegar, Monmouth. May 20. Shepard, Tredegar
Robinson, William, Leeds, Staff Printer. July 1. Bulmer and Son,
Leeds
Sanders, Susannah, Old Brentford, Middlesex. May 27. Sanders, Old
Brentford
Schuster, Edwin, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Surgeon. May 1.
Woodburne and Poole, Ulverston
Schuster, Mary, Ulverston, Lancashire, Grocer. May 1. Woodburne
and Poole, Ulverston
Thirst, John, Westbourne terrace, North Paddington, Gent. June 30.
Chaustrall and Co, Lincoln's Inn fields
Thomson, Henry, Liverpool, Secretory Public Company. June 1.
Simon and Co, Great George st, Westminster
Tomlinson, Anthony, Preston, Lancashire, Feinmonger. May 1. For-
shaw, Preston
Upton, Horace John, Tillington, Sussex, Wine Merchant. May 31.
Upton, Halton rd, Islington
Vousey, Henry John, Stoke Newington rd, Licensed Victualler. June
1. Child, Paul's Bakeshouse court, Doctors' commons
Wane, Richard, Skipton, York, Innkeeper. May 12. Brown, Skipton
Wormsley, James, College st, Chelsea, Undertaker. May 20. White,
Epsom
Wright, Charles, Barnsley, York, Gent. June 1. Newman and Sons,
Barnsley

TUESDAY, April 18, 1876.

Bobby, Caroline, Cook's rd, Kennington. May 20. Sole and Co,
Aldermanbury
Coulman, Ann, Pickering, York. May 15. Jackson, Malton
De Crespinay, Dame Mary Champion, Queen's gate, Kensington. July
1. Domville and Co, New square, Lincoln's Inn
Fleming, Henry, Charles st, Berkeley square, Esq. June 1. Ward and
Co, Gray's Inn square
Hargreaves, Lister, Frizinghall, Bradford, York, Shopkeeper. May
20. Atkinson, Bradford
Johnson, Ambrose, Stretford, Lancashire, Gent. May 15. Chapman
and Co, Manchester
Jones, Rev Evan Lloyd, Llandilo, Carmarthenshire. May 20. Bishop,
Llandilo
Mangan, John, Pleasant row, Canonbury, Gent. May 31. Phipps,
Farringdon st
Probert, Selina Jane, Bath. June 1. Stone and Co, Bath
Skeggs, Mary, Marborough hill, St John's wood. June 1. Ward and
Co, Gray's Inn square
Statham, Anna Elizabeth, Belper, Derby. June 1. Wells and Hind,
Nottingham
Susams, Charles, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Victualler. June 1.
Winter and Francis, Norwich
West, Eliza, Bedford gardens, Kensington. May 20. Fisher and Fisher,
Lambeth st

FRIDAY, April 21, 1876.

Anderton, John, St Helen's, Lancashire, Bookseller. May 20. Riley,
St Helen's
Baker, Sarah, Festonville rd. June 1. Eys and Co, John st, Bed-
ford row

Bowen, George, Swansea, Glamorgan, Solicitor. May 31. Spickett,
and Price, Pontypridd
Dinsdale, James, Hastings, Sussex, Gent. June 24. Cruttenden,
Battle
Edmonds, William, Jubilee st, Mile End rd, Gent. May 20. Smith and
Sons, Furnival's inn
Farrington, Jane, Cheltenham, Gloucester. June 2. Booty and
Baylife, Raymond building, Gray's inn
Fiske, Isaac, Stanton, Suffolk, Gent. May 31. Golding, Walsham-le-
Willows
Foster, Mary, Wainfleet St Mary, Lincoln. May 8. Bassett, Wain-
fleet
Goodwin, James, Tunstall, Stafford, Grocer. May 1. Hollinshead,
Tunstall
Holgate, Robert Hargreaves, Rangoon, Burmah, Engineer. May 17.
Brett, Manchester
Horton, John, Hougham, Kent, Grazier. May 20. Knockier, Dover
How, James, Goddesstone-next-Wingham, Kent, Gent. April 28.
Plummer and Fielding, Canterbury
Jeffreys, Robert, Merrick square, Southwark. May 26. Fowkes, Wal-
brook
Mellor, John Payne, Huddersfield, York. July 1. Owen, Hudders-
field
Ogden, Edward, Southport, Gent. May 12. Welaby and Co, South-
port
Patal, Katurah, Luston, Hereford. May 22. Harris, St James's st,
Pall mall
Sedgley, Charlotte, Longford, Foleshill, Warwick. June 1. Davis,
Coventry
Simpson, John Thomas, Alawick, Northumberland, Postmaster. June
1. Forster and Painter, Alawick
Stephenson, John, Allerthorpe, York, Farmer. June 21. Bell, Pock-
lington
Thacker, Henry, Blackman st, Southwark, Druggist's Assistant. May
31. Rhodes, Halifax
Tonks, Thomas, Birmingham, Farmer. May 12. Jelf, Birmingham
Van Zeller, Dorothy Clara, Gloucester place, Portman square. June
1. Johnson and Co, Austin friars
Windos, Thomas, Hinksey, Salop, Yeoman. June 24. Potts, Brose-
ley

— TUESDAY, April 25, 1876.

Bayley, Henry, Stalybridge, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. May 31.
Hall and Son, Manchester
Bendale, John, Codford St Mary, Wilts, Harness Maker. May 31.
Chapman and Ponting, Warminster
Clark, Arthur Robert, Beckenham, Kent, Gent. May 24. Prior and
Co, Lincoln's Inn fields
Campbell, George, Eccles, Lancashire, Gent. May 15. Simpson, Man-
chester
Cash, Fanny, Everton, nr Liverpool. July 19. Whitaker, Duchy of
Lancaster office
Clark, William, Wellicoe square, Brewer. May 22. Miller, Moorgate
at
Crabbs, Job, Hereford, Innkeeper. May 20. Boycott, Hereford
Ellery, Henry James, Axminster, Devon, Doctor of Medicine. June 24.
Forward, Axminster
Girling, William, Falmouth rd, New Kent rd. May 31. Fleming,
New Kent rd
Harbit, Joseph, Hurworth-on-Tees, Durham, Butcher. June 30. Fal-
conar, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Hooper, Edward, Charlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester, Innkeeper. June 1. Bullock, Manchester
How, John Shuckburgh, Mostyn rd, Brixton, Gent. May 30. Woolf,
King st, Cheapside
Howarth, John Heywood, Lancashire, Innkeeper. June 12. Grandy
and Co, Manchester
Lee, Edmund Goddard, Southgate rd, Kingsland, Linsendraper Buyer.
May 31. Mercer and Mercer, Oophall court
Mandrell, Rev Matthewman, Tatford, Lincoln. May 14. Tweed,
Horncastle
Marsh, John, Maude grove, West Brompton, Hairdresser. June 25.
Hancock and Co, King William st
Matindale, Rowland, Stockdalewath, Cumberland, Gent. June 1
Cartmell, Carlisle
Poake, Ellen Sophia, Cable st, St George-in-the-East. May 31. Jack-
son, Wellicoe square
Raabrook, Elizabeth, Marston, Cheshire. June 24. Fletcher, North-
wich
Staveley, John, Lancaster, Gent. May 31. Chapman and Co, Man-
chester
Stockdale, George, Hanover terrace, Notting hill, Esq. May 25.
Thomson, Great Winchester st
Stokes, James, Cheetham, Manchester, Gent. June 1. Bullock, Man-
chester
Welch, William, Birmingham, Gent. June 1. Crafter, Blackfriars rd,
Southwark
Wilkie, George, Whitwell, Isle of Wight, Doctor of Medicine. June 14.
Eldridge and Son, Newport
Worthy, Josiah, Sheffield, Gent. May 31. Greaves, Sheffield

FRIDAY, April 28, 1876.

Berins, Thomas, Manchester, Gent. June 12. Partington and Allen,
Manchester
Burridge, Albert John, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Hotel Keeper. June 1.
Hard, Cardiff
Caldecott, Thomas, Rugby, Warwick, Esq. June 30. Benn, Rugby
Cavendish, Hon Richard, Thoroton Hall, Buckingham. June 1. Leman
and Co, Lincoln's Inn fields
Christians, John, Liphook, Hants, Grocer. June 1. Albery and Lucas,
Midhurst
Clement, George, Holbeach, Lincoln, Victualler. May 31. Stanton,
Holbeach
Clement, Mary Ann, Holbeach, Lincoln. May 31. Stanton, Holbeach
Collier, Thomas, Leamington, Warwick, Surgeon. May 30.
Whiston, Worcester
Dartington, John, Higham, York, Publican. June 1. Newman and
Sons, Barnsley
Edwards, Thomas Wilkinson, Woodhouse, Devonshire, Esq. June 4.
Petherick, Exeter

Ellis, John, Liverpool, Veterinary Surgeon. June 6. Radcliffe and Smith, Liverpool
 Foster, Dodson, Maida Vale, Gent. June 1. Lydall, Southampton buildings, Chancery Lane
 Frith, Sarah, Richmond, York. May 28. Burdakin and Co, Sheffield
 Gooch, Albert, Acre Lane, Brixton, Esq. June 14. Emmet and Son, Bloomsbury square
 Gudgin, Richard, Houghton Conquest, Bedford, Farmer. June 20. Mitchell and Webb, Bedford
 Hardeman, Joseph Tilley, Redditch, Worcester, Leather Merchant. May 1. Sherratt, Kidsgrove
 Holland, John Bailey, Cambria, Cochin China, Gent. Aug 26. Griffin, Birmingham
 Hunt, William John, Silverstone, Northampton, Surgeon. May 30. Whittton, Worcester
 Jeffreys, Anne, Manchester, Carriage Builder. June 12. Partington and Allen, Manchester
 Jennings, John, Shipston-on-Stour, Worcester, Nurseryman. May 20. Hancock and Hiron, Shipston-on-Stour
 Jones, John, Seaforth, Lancashire, Master Mariner. May 31. Bateson and Co, Liverpool
 Martin, Thomas, Pendlebury, Lancashire, Doctor of Medicine. June 24. Weston and Co, Manchester
 McKie, Alexander, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Soda Water Manufacture r. June 1. Eledon, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Morant, George, Wimborne, Dorset, Esq. July 21. Janson and Co, Finsbury circus
 Murgridge, Joseph Dawson, Aldershot, Hants, Printer. May 31. Hollest and Mason, Farmham, Surrey
 Morris, Charles Wallace, Woodhall, Halifax, York, Esq. July 1. Emmet and Emmet, Halifax
 Morris, Charles, Mutteral Farm, Gloucester, Farmer. June 1. Franklin, Dursley
 Salmon, Arthur, Plympton St Mary, Devon, Lieut Col Retired List Madras Army. June 1. Smith and Paul, Truro
 Skipworth, Eliza, South Kelsey, Lincoln. June 30. Stamp and Co, Hull
 Owen, Sarah, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. July 3. Plummer, Bristol
 Spencer, Ebenezer, Steward st, Spitalfields, Gent. June 30. Brown, Finsbury place
 Symons, Julia, Kingston-upon-Hull, Silversmith. June 5. England and Co, Hull
 Temple, Eliza, Margate, Kent. May 31. Pickett and Mytton, King's Bench walk, Temple
 Vining, Caroline, St John's park, Upper Holloway. June 24. Walker and Martineau, King's rd, Gray's inn
 Willcox, John, Kings-pon-Hull, I ommoner. Aug 1. Roberts and Leah, Kingston-upon-Hull

TUESDAY, May 2, 1876.

Babington, Catherine, Tunbridge Wells, Kent. June 24. Walker and Martineau, King's rd, Gray's inn
 Baine, Charles, Harley st, Esq. June 1. Van Sandau and Cumming, King st, Cheapside
 Bardon, Robert, Bradesburton, York, Farmer. June 1. Newton and Co, York
 Bewglass, James, Wakefield, York, Independent Minister. June 1. Scholey and Co, Wakefield
 Booth, Thomas, Rode Heath, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. May 16. Smith, Tunstall
 Bull, James, Huntingdon, Pork Butcher. May 23. Maule and Burton, Huntingdon
 Butt, William, Plymouth, Devon, Draper. June 1. Whiteford and Bennett, Plymouth
 Crossley, Robert, Didsbury, nr Manchester, Packer. June 1. Chew and Sons, Manchester
 Crowther, Ellen, Grange moor, Kirkheaton, York. June 13. Sykes and Son, Huddersfield
 Davies, Samuel, St Clears, Carmarthen, General Shopkeeper. June 1. Thomas and Brown, Carmarthen
 Day, Francis, Chudleigh, Devon, Gent. June 1. Moyle, Chudleigh
 Deare, Catherine, Gloucester place, Portman square. June 12. Wansey and Bowen, Moorgate
 Freer, Harriet, West Malvern, Worcester. June 24. Cheese, Amerham
 Graves, Frances Sarah, Malta. June 27. Wynne and Son, Lincoln's Inn fields
 Hale, Marian, Edensbridge, Kent. May 18. Betts, Ely place
 Langman, John, Winchester, Builder. June 1. Collins, Winchester
 Marriott, Christopher, Southwell, Nottingham, Gent. June 14. Stanton, Southwell
 Meandrell, Henry Charles, Cains, Wilts. June 15. Keary and Co, Chippenham
 Morris, Martha, Bristol. June 24. Ashurst and Co, Old Jewry
 Ogle, Elizabeth, Clifton, nr York. May 8. Lawton, York
 Ogle, Hannah Jane, Clifton, nr York. May 8. Lawton, York
 Ogle, Harriet, Clifton, nr York. May 8. Lawton, York
 Ogle, Thomasin, Clifton, nr York. May 8. Lawton, York
 Oliver, Evan, Manev, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick, Gent. June 12. Holbeche and Addenbrooke, Sutton Coldfield
 Herrick, William Perry, Beaumont park, nr Loughborough, Leicestershire, Esq. June 30. Bowker and Co, Bedford row
 Rande, Thomas Beer, East Stonehouse, Devon, Saddler. June 24. Phillips, Plymouth
 Shorting, Rev Charles, Stonham, Aspal, Suffolk. June 5. Hayward and Sons, Needham Market
 Smith, Walter Garadoc, Seisdon, Surrey, Esq. July 1. Freshfields and Williams, Barn buildings
 Stokes, Adrian Nicholson John, St Botolph's, Pembroke, Esq. June 24. James, Haverforwest
 Swinhorne, Frances, Claricarde gardens, Bayswater. June 12. Wansey and Bowen, Moorgate st
 Trowe, Samuel Phillips, Hele Barton, Devon, Farmer. June 8. Gidley, Plymouth
 Wood, Abraham, Holditch Farm, Stafford, Farmer. June 26. Harding, Newcastle-under-Lyme
 Yates, Rich ard Augustus, Margaret st, Cavendish square. June 1. Parkin an d Pagden, Lincoln's inn

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 28, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

Beckett, Henry John, Bread st, Silk Merchant. Pet April 26. Spring-Rice. May 9 at 12
 Campbell, Sir Gilbert Edward, Ladbrooke grove rd, Notting hill Bart. Pet April 27. Murray. May 10 at 12
 Lyon, Frank, Watling st, Soap Maker. Pet April 27. Murray. May 17 at 11
 Whatman, Harriet Elizabeth, Cambridge rd, Maida hill. Pet April 26. Spring-Rice. May 9 at 2

To Surrender in the Country.

Blanchford, Henry, Exeter, Devon, Stock Broker. Pet April 24. Daw. Exeter, May 15 at 11
 Leon, Herutus, Bath, Jeweller. Pet April 27. Smith. Bath, May 8. at 1
 Priestley, Thomas, and Simeon Priestley, Halifax, York, Woolstaplers. Pet April 25. Giffard. Halifax, May 13 at 11
 Pryce, Elijah, Liverpool, Merchant. Pet April 25. Watson. Liverpool, May 11 at 2

TUESDAY, May 2, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Smith, Lucy, Cornwall rd, Notting hill, no occupation. Pet April 23. Keene. May 16 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Evans, Robert, Chiswick, Middlesex, Builder. Pet April 29. Ruston. Brentford, May 16 at 10
 Hancock, George, Liverpool, Stock Broker. Pet April 28. Watson. Liverpool, May 15 at 2
 Holloway, Elizabeth Heath, Southampton, Whiting Manufacturer. Pet April 25. Walker. Southampton, May 18 at 12
 Laitham, Michael, Gateshead, Durham, Mason. Pet April 29. Mortimer. Newcastle, May 17 at 12
 Mount, Ingram Easdale, Sh offield, Oil Merchant. Pet April 28. Wake. Sheffield, May 12 at 11.30
 Pendlebury, George, Hyde, Cheshire, Hat Manufacturer. Pet April 25. Hall. Ashton-under-Lyne, May 11 at 11
 Smith, Barbara, Worksop, Nottingham, Coal Merchant. Pet April 27. Wake. Sheffield, May 12 at 12
 Stowell, Esther, and Ann Everitt, Lymington, Devon. Pet April 27. Daw. Exeter, May 15 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, April 28, 1876.

Kearsley, James, Manchester, Coach Builder. April 25

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

TUESDAY, April 25, 1876.

Abbott, William Thomas, Torquay, Devon, Boot Maker. May 6 at 11 at offices of Fowings, Queen st, Exeter. Higgins, Exeter
 Appleton, John Thomas, Spennymoor, Durham, Auctioneer. May 11 at 10 at the Wheat Sheaf Inn, Spennymoor
 Arnold, Thomas, Eagle st, City rd, Draper. May 12 at 2 at offices of Wood, Paul's churchyard
 Benson, Tom Morgan, Bishopston, Glamorgan, Auctioneer. May 5 at 11.30 at offices of Cox, Adelaide chambers, Swansea
 Bird, William, Godshill, Stafford, Farmer. May 4 at 11 at offices of Salt, Tunstall
 Blackman, John, Caversham, Oxon, Miller. May 6 at 11 at offices of Dodd, Friar st, Reading
 Booth, Alfred, and Charles Stewart Robson, Cleckheaton, York, Stuff Manufacturers. May 11 at 11 at offices of Gardiner, Bond st, Bradford
 Busion, John, Bishop Middleham, Durham, Grocer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Little, Saddler st, Durham
 Butt, John, Gosport, Hants, Contractor. May 9 at 3 at offices of Blake, High st, Gosport
 Chaney, Charles Douglas, and Arthur Catt, Bidford, Warwick, Paper Manufacturers. May 6 at 11 at offices of Smith and Howard, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
 Cheshire, Henry, Rotherham, York, Grocer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Badger, Westgate, Rotherham
 Collins, George, Bristol, Lasses of Billiard Tables. May 8 at 12 at offices of Benson and Thomas, Broad st, Bristol
 Daggers, William, Liverpool, Painter. May 19 at 12 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool
 Davies, Thomas, John Davies, and Thomas Edwards, Mold, Flint, Tallow Chandlers. May 6 at 2 at the Black Lion Hotel, Mold, Williams, Mold
 Davies, Thomas, Seaham Harbour, Durham, Builder. May 11 at 11 at offices of Wright, Tempest place, Seaham Harbour
 Dean, Henry, Southam, Warwick, Surveyor. May 5 at 3 at offices of Wood, Southam, or Rusby
 Dicker, John, Ashby st, Clerkenwell, Pawnbroker. May 6 at 12 at 146, Cheapside, Freeman, Gutter lane, Cheapside
 Dutton, Samuel, Tipton, Stafford, Confectioner. May 9 at 3 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton
 Earsleshaw, George, Dewsberry, York, Fishmonger. May 8 at 2.30 at offices of Stapleton, Union st, Dewsberry
 Edwards, John, Hoel Fach Ystrad, Ystrad-fodwg, Glamorgan, Grocer. May 6 at 11.30 at the New Inn Hotel, Pontypridd. Thomas, Pontypridd
 Emerson, George William, Seaham Harbour, Durham, Draper. May 8 at 11 at offices of Wright, Tempest place, Seaham Harbour
 Fishburn, Christopher, Northallerton, York, Innkeeper. May 12 at 11 at offices of Stevenson and Meek, Paradise terrace, Darlington
 Fishburn, William, Scorton, York, Labourer. May 12 at 11 at offices of Stevenson and Meek, Paradise terrace, Darlington

Fletcher, John, Bath, Painter. May 3 at 2.30 at 5, Westgate buildings, Bath. Wilton

Forbes, John, Sunderland, Durham, Draper. May 9 at 2 at offices of Bowey, Fawcett st., Sunderland

Foreman, Joseph, Hinckley, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. May 8 at 12 at the Blue Lion Hotel, Granby st., Leicester. Bland, Nuneaton

Frankford, Moss, Whitechapel rd., Cigar Manufacturer. May 15 at 3 at offices of Green, Queen st., Cheapside

French, Thomas, Lewisham, Kent, Builder. May 9 at 12 at offices of Greenfield, Abchurch lane

Garnett, James, Francis, and John Wooding, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturers. May 9 at 11 at offices of Becke, Market square, Northampton

Graham, David, Darlington, Durham, Draper. May 1 at 11 at offices of Stevenson and Meek, Darlington

Gray, John, Holyhead, Anglesey, Grocer. May 9 at 12.30 at the Castle Hotel, Bangor

Gregory, John Turner, Sheffield, Estate Agent. May 4 at 12 at offices of Legee, George st., Sheffield. Stacey, Sheffield

Harris, Frederick Harvey Barr, Claremont square, Goldsmith. May 8 at 2 at offices of Spyer and Son, Winchelsea House, Old Broad st., Head, Samuel Heath, King William st., Solicitor. May 10 at 12 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st., Wild and Co., Ironmonger lane

Hennet, Follett Charles, Hugh st., Pimlico, Commission Agent. May 8 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane

Hoffenbach, Isidore, Upper Thomas st., Merchant. May 11 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane

Holden, Charles Henry, New mews, Dorset square, Timber Merchant. May 12 at 2 at offices of Elcane and Helcombe, Bedford row, Holborn

Holmes, John, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Boot Maker. May 8 at 2 at offices of Griffith, Lass lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Holmes, William Henry, Fenton, Stafford, Boot Manufacturer. May 5 at 1 at offices of Lees, Waterloo rd., Birkenhead

Hows, John Edward, Leicester, Draper. May 9 at 12 at offices of the Trade Protection Society, New st., Leicester

Howcord, Joseph, Dowsbury, York, Woollapler. May 10 at 3 at offices of Good, Union st., Dowsbury. Fryer

Humpage, William, Stafford, Saddler. May 5 at 12.30 at offices of Morgan, Stafford

Hurst, James, Manchester, Stationer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Ritson and Grundy, Cross st., Manchester

Impey, Bedford, Birmingham, Gilt Jeweller. May 5 at 11 at offices of Morgan, Waterloo st., Birmingham

Ireland, James, Manchester, Cotton Waste Merchant. May 11 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester

James, John, and David James, Treherbert, Glamorgan, Grocers. May 5 at 12 at offices of Collins, Jun., Broad st., Bristol, Stanley and Wabrough, Bristol

Jeffreys, Alfred Henry, Southampton, Printer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Shatto, Portland st., Southampton

Jenkins, William, Compton, Durham, Baker. May 12 at 12 at offices of McAlpin and Co., Grainger st., west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Salkeld, Durham

Jennings, Solomon, Old Brompton, Gillington, Kent, Greengrocer. May 6 at 11 at the Mure Hotel, High st., Chatham

Jones, Josiah Henry, Llanelli, Carmarthen, Hairdresser. May 5 at 12 at the Thomas Arms Hotel, Llanelli

Kennedy, William, Blackley, nr Manchester, Draper. May 12 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st., Manchester

King, George, Old Weston, Huntington, Farmer. May 10 at 11 at the George Hotel, Huntington. Hunnybun

Lloyd, Charles, Horsham, Sussex, Cabinet Maker. May 11 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st., Black and Co., Brighton

Lilliman, William, Gringley-on-the-Hill, Nottingham, Farmer. May 8 at 11 at the Black Head Inn, Gainsborough. Flaskeit, Gainsborough

Marshall, Frederick, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Solicitor. May 8 at 10 at office of Pruen, Regent st., Cheltenham

Moorhouse, James, Bury, Lancashire, Cotton Waste Spinner. May 8 at 3 at offices of Arderton, Garden st., Bury

Morrell, Francis, Alnwick, Northumberland, Station Master. May 5 at 2 at offices of Chartres and Youll, Grainger at west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Myers, Barnett, Birmingham, Jeweller. May 8 at 3 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st., Birmingham

Owen, George, Manchester, Calenderer. May 11 at 2 at offices of Horner, Clarence st., Manchester

Oxley, Catherine, Eckington, Derby, Postmistress. May 8 at 11 at offices of Cutts, New square, Chesterfield

Palfrey, John Firman, Redgrave, Suffolk, Innkeeper. May 8 at 2 at the Bell Hotel, Rickingham Interior. Gross

Parry, William, Jackson st., Holloway, Sewing Machine Merchant. May 15 at 2 at 19, White Lion st., Norton Folgate. Barnard

Patton, James Alexander, Mountford, Jamaica st., Mile End rd., Retired Captain H.M.'s Army. May 8 at 3 at offices of Fisher and Co., Leicestershire

Pegler, Frederick Uriah, Brynhyfryd, nr Swansea, Glamorgan, Builder. May 8 at 11 at 1, Worcester place, Swansea. Brown and Collins

Pike, Thomas, Hackney rd., Boot Manufacturer. May 16 at 2 at offices of Brown, Basinghall st., Liverpool

Pine, John, Bratton Clovelly, Devon, Blacksmith. May 9 at 4 at the London Inn, Okehampton. Landice, Okehampton

Potts, Jesse, Wyre Bank, or Walall, Mine Agent. May 8 at 11 at offices of Duigan and Co., The Bridge, Walall

Pratt, John, Liverpool, Stevedore. May 8 at 2 at offices of Fowler, Cable st., Liverpool

Ratcliff, Thomas, Stapenhill, Derby, Builder. May 9 at 12 at the White Hart Hotel, High st., Burton-upon-Trent. Drewry, Burton-upon-Trent

Richardson, James Bracken, Kittridgeling, Westmorland, Cattle Dealer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Johnson and Tilly, Sun st., Lancaster

Roberts, William, Bridgnorth, Glamorgan, Builder. May 9 at 3 at offices of Walker, Caroline st., Bridgnorth

Scobicroome, William, Willenhall, Stafford, Boot Manufacturer. May 6 at 12 at offices of Creswell, New rd., Willenhall

Searle, George Carew, Trump st., Cheapside, Manufacturer. May 9 at 2 at offices of Hogan and Hughes, Martin's Lane

Shackleton, George Binns, Manningham, Bradford, York, Agent. May 17 at 10 at offices of Rennells, Tyrrell st., Bradford

Shairp, Henry Gideon, and John Montefiore, jun., Leadenhall st., Commission Merchants. May 11 at 2 at offices of Ashley and Tee, Fredericks place, Old Jewry

Sheward, Henry, Coventry, Pork Butcher. May 8 at 12 at offices of Minister, Trinity churchyard, Coventry

Smith, John, and William Henry Maxwell Daiston, Cheapside, Italian Warehousemen. May 9 at 11 at 143, Cheapside. Robinson, Christchurch passage, Newgate st

Spurrier, Walter, Worcester, out of business. May 6 at 10.15 at offices of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry st., Birmingham

Stewart, Hugh, Liverpool, Ironfounder. May 9 at 2 at offices of Smith and Co., Brunswick st., Liverpool

Stothard, Robert Bayard, Beverley, York, Grocer. May 6 at 11 at offices of Hind, Well lane, Beverley

Teggins, Joseph, Warrington, Lancashire, Sail Maker. May 8 at 3 at offices of Boyle, Cairo street chambers, Warrington

Terrell, James, Manchester, Builder. May 8 at 2 at the Merchant's Hotel, Oldham st., Manchester. Farrington, Manchester

Tonge, Morris, Bowring Green lane, Clerkenwell, Builder. May 12 at 3 at offices of Tilbury and Gribble, King st., Cheapside

Tonge, Morris, Thrussington Grange, Leicester, Farmer. May 11 at 11 at offices of Page, jun., Flaxengate, Lincoln

Walch, Henry, and James Hodge Macdonald, Manchester, Manufacturer. May 10 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester

Walker, Cooper and Sons, Manchester

Walker, Henry, Liverpool, Horse Dealer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Carruthers, Clayton square, Liverpool

Ward, Fuller, Bridport place, New North rd., Hoxton, Boot Manufacturer. May 9 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane

Webb, John, Buckingham, Hair Dresser. May 9 at 2 at the Swan and Castle Hotel, Buckingham. Crosby, Banbury

Wem, George, Wrockwardine Wood, Salop, Agent. May 6 at 11.30 at offices of Leake, Shifnal, Salop

Westfield, William James, Park terrace, Church rd., Leyton, Essex, Assistant Schoolmaster. May 17 at 2 at offices of Slatar and Pannell, Gildshall chambers, Parry, Basinghall st.

Willcox, Frederick William, Tranmere, Cheshire, Boot Maker. May 5 at 3 at offices of Moore, Duncan st., Birkenhead

Willatts, Thomas, Abbott Bromley, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. May 9 at 1 at offices of Cooper and Chawner, Uttoxeter

Williams, Philip, Kennett rd., Harrow rd., Paddington, Carpenter. May 2 at 3 at the Bell and Anchor Hotel, West Kensington gardens, Ham-moramish rd., Wright, Crosby Hall chambers

Wood, William, Sunderland, Durham, Shipowner. May 9 at 11 at offices of Brown and Son, Vivers st., Sunderland

Wynne, Richard Horton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, Mining Engineer. May 4 at 3 at offices of Ashmall, Cheapside, Hanley

FAIRDAY, April 28, 1876.

Adamson, James, Hatton garden. May 17 at 3 at offices of Peckham and Co., Knight Rider st. Doctors' common

Ancomb, John, Taverne, Felling, Durham, Beer Agent. May 11 at 12 at offices of Robson, Town Hall, Gateshead-on-Tyne

Appleton, Thomas William, Blyton, Stafford, Glass Dealer. May 20 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st., Wolverhampton

Arthur, Benjamin Percy, Upper st., Illington, Grocer. May 8 at 12 at 4, Arthur st. east, London bridge. Tickle

Austin, Thomas, Ringstead, Northampton, Baker. May 8 at 12 at offices of Barnham and Henry, High st., Wellingborough

Bebbington, Levi, Huime, Manchester, Baker. May 19 at 3 at offices of Law, King st., Manchester

Bell, Robert, He therington, Ulverston, Lancashire, Coal Dealer. May 10 at 11 at the Temperance Hall, Ulverston. Jackson

Bevie, Charles, Church st., Croydon, Tailor. May 8 at 11 at offices of Dennis, St John's grove, Croydon

Blyton, Cornelius Williams, Old Kent rd., Draper. May 16 at 3 at offices of Merchant and Purvis, George yard, Lombard st., Botham, Benjamin William, Brighton, Sussex, Music Hall Proprietor. May 9 at 3 at the Old Ship Hotel, Brighton. Goodmorn, Brighton

Bowers, Henry George, Thornbury, nr Bradford, York, Merchant's Salesman. May 10 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st., Bradford

Brearley, William, and Edwin Brearley, Halifax, York, Millwrights. May 15 at 11 at the White Swan Hotel, Princess st., Halifax. Longbottom, Halifax

Briley, Ann, Leeds, Tobacconist. May 9 at 2 at offices of Palian, Bank Chambers, Park row, Leeds

Botton, George, Kingston-upon-Hull, Machinist. May 11 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Charlotte st., Kingston-upon-Hull. Walker and Spink, Hull

Carter, Robert, sen., Tottenham court rd., Jeweller. May 8 at 10 at office of Hope, Jun., Great James st., Bedford row. Rice

Clegg, Thomas, Hatley, York, Woolen Manufacturer. May 17 at 3 at the Talbot Hotel, Hatley. Wooley

Clinton, James, Willenhall, Stafford, News Agent. May 12 at 11 at offices of Vaughan, Market place, Willenhall

Cobb, Francis, Newton-upon-Trent, Lincoln, Shoe Maker. May 11 at 12 at offices of Hughes, Bank st., Lincoln

Collins, Joseph, Birmingham, Silversmith. May 8 at 11 at offices of Green, Waterloo st., Birmingham

Collins, William, Leader st., Chelsea, Marine Store Dealer. May 11 at 10 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Kitch and Co., Cannon st.

Cordery, James William, Sunderland, Durham, Paper Merchant. May 9 at 12 at offices of Robinson, Villiers st., Sunderland

Crossley, John, Cle, Lincoln, Grocer. May 13 at 11 at offices of Grange and Winttingham, St Mary's chamber, West St. Mary's gate, Great Grimsby

Davies, John, and Evan Davies, Liverpool, Drapers. May 16 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st., Liverpool

Dombrain, William, Mayfield, Sussex, Farmer. May 15 at 11 at office of Burton, Dyott terrace, Tunbridge Wells

Fenton, Richard, Dewsbury, York, Coal Merchant. May 11 at 3 at offices of Learoyd and Co., Buxton rd., Huddersfield

Fleetwood, George, Lesswood, Salop, Gent. May 12 at 2 at offices of Banks and Kendall, Church st., Liverpool

Foster, James, Sunderland, Mechanical Engineer. May 11 at 3 at offices of Holmes and Brown, John st., Sunderland

Francis, John, Tredgar, Monmouth, Grocer. May 17 at 1 at the Queen's Hotel, Newport. Davies

Fox, William, Bridgewater, High Wycombe, Buckingham, Baker. May 13 at 2 at the Council chamber, Town Hall, High Wycombe, Bucks.
Clarke, High Wycombe

Fred, Charles John, Little Chart, Kent, Bricklayer. May 10 at 3 at offices of Hallett and Co, North st, Ashford

French, George, Vleewale, West Drayton, Middlesex, no occupation. May 16 at 1 at 111, Cheapside. Philip, Sudge row, Cannon st

Gibbs, Archibald Watson, Liverpool, Commercial Clerk. May 12 at 2 at offices of Pemberton and Sampson, Harrington st, Liverpool

Giles, Edward, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Butcher. May 12 at 12 at offices of Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare

Gillibrand, John William, Manchester, Baker. May 15 at 8 at offices of Heath and Sons, Swan st, Manchester

Godfrick, John, Crown st, Hoxton square, Hoxton, Tin Plate Worker. May 13 at 3 at the Masons' Hall, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st.

Feuillard, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn

Goodman, Thomas, High st, Poplar, Boot Maker. May 9 at 10 at offices of Kisch and Co, Cannon st

Grierson, James, Leeds, Draper. May 13 at 10.30 at offices of Malcolm, Park row, Leadenhall st

Hall, Emanuel, Dewsbury, York, Marble Mason. May 12 at 2.30 at off. o. o. of Stapleton, Union st, Dewsbury

Hancock, William Olding, Fenchurh st, Wine Merchant. May 23 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' Avenue, Basinghall st. Ramsden and Austin, Leadenhall st

Hawkins, George, Oystermouth, Glamorgan, Builder. May 10 at 3 at offices of B-or-and Bill, York place, Swansea

Hetherington, Thomas, Manchester, House Furnisher. May 15 at 2 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Hicks, Julian Sherich Batt, Lyndhurst grove, Peckham, Scenic Artist. May 18 at 11 at offices of Wright and Abrahams, High Holborn

Howard, Frederick James, Canterbury, Grocer. May 16 at 1 at offices of Doyle, Carew st, Lincoln's inn, Delasaux, Canterbury

Hughes, Robert, Crewe, Cheshire, Grocer. May 11 at 11.30 at the Royal Hotel, Wantage rd, Crewe, Pointon

Joynton, William Castle Northwich, Cheshire, Joiner. May 10 at 11 at the Town Bridge Lecture Room, Northwich. Fletcher Lange, Christian Harry, Wilson st, Gray's inn rd, Latche Maker. May 6 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Bedford row

Lee, James, Hulme, Manchester, Beer Retailer. May 18 at 3 at offices of Law, King st, Manchester

Lee, John, Birmingham, Builder. May 5 at 12 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham

Lidgord, James Pearce, Kingston, Surrey, Cattle Dealer. May 16 at 4 at the Cricketers' Inn, Fairfield, Kingston. Marshal Lopez, Eugenio, Old Broad st, Merchant. May 22 at 2 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st, Montague, Bucklersbury

Mariott, George, Barnsley, York, Furniture Broker. May 18 at 3 at the Coach and Horses Hotel, Barnsley

Mason, Amos, Sheffield, Joiner. May 13 at 4 at offices of Gee, Fig Tree chambers, Sheffield. Binns, Sheffield

Mason, Samuel, Heywood, Lancashire, Ironfounder. May 12 at 2 at offices of Orton and Bryan, Ridgefield, Manchester

Mason, Thomas James, Gutter lane, Warehoueman. May 8 at 3 at offices of Hudgel and Dells, Gresham st, Marsden, Little Britain

Masters, Thomas, Netherend, Cradley, Worcester, Machine Clerk. May 12 at 2 at offices of Prescott, High st, Stourbridge

McGrath, James, Liverpool, Baker. May 11 at 2 at offices of Harris, Union court, Castle st, Liverpool

Moore, William, Sheffield, out of business. May 15 at 12 at offices of Aunty and Son, Queen st, Sheffield

Morgan, Rees, Dowlais, Glamorgan, Shoe Maker. May 16 at 1 at offices of James, High st, Marthry Tydfil

Monox, Thomas, Birmingham, Jeweller. May 9 at 11 at offices of Davies, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Musham, John, Scarborough, York, no occupation. May 12 at 12 at offices of Nethersole, New inn, Strand, Watts, Scarborough

Palmer, Josiah, Ewias Harold, Hereford, Builder. May 13 at 3 at offices of Corner, High Town, Hereford

Parkes, Samuel, Cradley, Worcester, Builder. May 10 at 11 at offices of Homer, High st, Brierley Hill

Perry, Thomas, Sedgley, Stafford, Builder. May 11 at 11 at the Pipe Hall Hotel, Hall st, Bilston. Fellowes, Bilston

Potts, Samuel, Hardley, Norfolk, Cattle Dealer. May 10 at 4 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich

Potts, Frank Brinewood, Reedworth st, Kensington rd, Gent. May 22 at 12 at offices of Haynes, Grecian chambers, Dovercourt, Temple

Prigg, George, Bristol, Greengrocer. May 10 at 10 at offices of Fernyhough, Bridge st, Bristol. Price, Bristol

Purgrave, John, Cowper rd, South Hornsey, Cabinet Manufacturer. May 10 at 2 at offices of Barrett, Bell yard, Doctors' common

Reading, James, Derby, Boot Manufacturer. May 9 at 4 at offices of Brigg, Amen alley, Derby. Gretton, Derby

Richardson, Edward, Ravensthorpe, York, Machinist. May 15 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway, Church st, Dewsbury

Roberts, Arthur Edwin, Bracknell, Berks, Boot Maker. May 19 at 3 at Wheeler and Sergeant, Bracknell

Robinsons, James, Birmingham, Hardwood Turner. May 11 at 11 at offices of James, Temple st, Birmingham

Robson, William, and Christopher Hawell, Beddington, Northumberland, Corn Millers. May 10 at 3 at offices of Nicholae, Bridge st, Morpeth

Rosenberg, Isaac, Leeds, Manufacturer's Foreman. May 12 at 12 at offices of Whiteley, Albion st, Leeds

Seagrave, James Pullen, Rochester row, Westminster, Zinc Worker. May 8 at 12 at offices of Hill and Goudge, Bishopsgate at within. Hobbes

Shrussoe, William, Westborough, Maidstone, Kent, Wheelwright. May 24 at 3 at the Bell Hotel, Week st, Maidstone. Weekes and Son, Cheapside

Simpson, Thomas, Birmingham, Commission Agent. May 9 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Slater, William, Barnsley, York, Shoe Manufacturer. May 11 at 11 at offices of Parker, Ragent st, Barnsley

Smith, John, Leeds, Earthenware Dealer. May 11 at 4 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Hanley. Lodge

Smith, Josiah, Ludlow, Salop, Bookseller. May 11 at 12 at the New Buildings, Ludlow. Anderson and Davies

Smith, Thomas, Birmingham, Builder. May 12 at 2 at offices of Cheson, Moor st, Birmingham

Stone, Edwin, Chippenham terrace, Harrow rd, Cabinet Maker. May 8 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Hatton garden, Holborn

Stont, Robert, P reston, Lancashire, Tailor. May 12 at 2 at offices of Blackhurst, Fox st, Preston

Strauss, Carl, Birmingham, Export Merchant. May 8 at 11 at the Midland H otel, New st, Birmingham. Sargent and Son, Birmingham

Strickland, George Thomas, Shaford, Bedford, Baker. May 10 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, Shaford. Barker, Hitchin, Herts

Stubbs, Samuel, Witton, Cheshire, Grocer. May 8 at 11 at offices of Pointon, Market st, Crewe town

Thompson, Henry, Rochdale, Lancashire, Tin Plate Worker. May 11 at 3 at offices of Ashworth, Yorkshire st, Rochdale

Thomson, Henry Turner, St John st, Clerkenwell, Stationer. May 15 at 3 at offices of Noon and Clarke, Bloomsfield st

Thompson, James, Liverpool, Provision Dealer. May 17 at 2 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Beltringer, Liverpool

Topham, Wilson, Bramley, Leeds, Worsted Coating Manufacturer. May 12 at 2.30 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

Trott, George, Gloucester, Tailor. May 8 at 2 at the Bell Hotel, Gloucester. Taynton and Son, Gloucester

Turner, Mary Matilda, Gorval wood, Sedgely, Stafford, Beerseller. May 5 at 11 at offices of Waldron, Priory st, Dudley

Usher, Silas, York, Jobbing Gardener. May 9 at 11 at offices of Thompson, Jun, Lendal, York

Ward, Nicholas, Birmingham, out of business. May 11 at 3 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Bennetts hill, Birmingham

Warren, Edward, Birmingham, Leather Seller. May 9 at 11 at offices of Maher and Fonsie, Tampie st, Birmingham

Weaver, Thomas Sivil, Whitefriars, Aston, Worcester, Farm Ballif. May 9 at 11.30 at the Hop Market Hotel, Worcester. Miller and Co, Kidderminster

Williams, John L., Ebbw vale, Monmouth, Grocer. May 12 at 1 at offices of James, High st, Marthry Tydfil

Williams, Samuel, Caerlaverock, York, Grocer. May 11 at 2 at offices of Phillips, Carlton st, Castleford

Willis, Thomas Henry, Rothwell, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Burnham and Henry, High st, Wellingborough

Windfeld, Frank, Hingham, Norfolk, Chemist. May 9 at 12 at offices of Emerson and Sparrow, Rampart Horse st, Norwich

Wood, Henry Alexander, Bristol, Confectioner. May 15 at 12 at offices of Sherrard, Baldwin st, Bristol

Wright, John Watson, and George Samuel Twidale, Kingston-upon-Hall, Cabinet Makers. May 4 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Charlotte st, Kingston-upon-Hall. Walker and Spink

TUESDAY, May 2, 1876.

Baden, Thomas Jenner, Drury court, Strand, Licensed Victualler. May 17 at 1 at offices of Frogatt, Argyll st, Regent st

Barker, William Isaac, Lynsted, Kent, Fishmonger. May 18 at 11 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne

Basker, Charles Peregrine, Birmingham, Milliner. May 15 at 3 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham

Berry, William, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Tailor. May 20 at 10 at offices of Clark, High st, Cheltenham

Bowen, Thomas, Oldham, Lancashire, General Dealer. May 16 at 3 at offices of Ponsonby and Carlile, Clegg st, Oldham

Briery, James Edward, Oldham, Lancashire, Tailor. May 17 at 3 at offices of Royles, York chambers, King st, Manchester. Gardner, Manchester

Chapman, Edward, Newport, Monmouth, Boot Manufacturer. May 12 at 1 at offices of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. Morgan, Pontypool

Church, Rev Samuel Church, Shaftesbury rd, Hammersmith. May 16 at 2 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Prior and Co

Collins, Henry, St Alban's, Herts, Physician. May 16 at 3 at 111, at 11 at Cheapside. Philip, Sudge row, Cannon st

Coney, Isaac, Maivern rd, Canterbury rd, Kirbys, Builder. May 15 at 11 at offices of Cr. wher, Queen st, Cheapside

Cook, Nathaniel Henry, Lawrence lane, Stationer. May 11 at 3 at offices of Cattlin, Guildhall yard

Cox, Abraham Smith, Banbury, Oxford, Draper. May 15 at 12 at offices of Pellatt, High st, Banbury

Croshaw, George, Kingston-upon-Hull, Hairdresser. May 12 at 12 at offices of Walker and Spink, Parliament st, Hull

Curley, William Hughes, Oldham, Lancashire, Boot Maker. May 16 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard, Manchester. Blackburne and Co, Oldham

Currie, Robert, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Dealer. May 12 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Davis, Hannah, Treherber, Glamorgan, Grocer. May 12 at 12 at the New Inn Hotel, Pontypridd. Thomas, Pontypridd

Davies, Thomas, Maesteg, Glamorgan, Saddler. May 23 at 11 at 18, High st, Cardiff. Morgan

Dearden, Richard Henry, Manchester, Hairdresser. May 17 at 3 at Norfolk st, Manchester. Parker

Devereux, John Godfrey, Bromyard, Hereford, Grocer. May 16 at 3 at offices of Meredith, College st, Worcester

Dodd, William, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Draper. May 17 at 11 at offices of Marshall, jun, Claypath, Durham

Ducou, Pierre, Llanelli, Carmarthen, Ship Broker. May 12 at 10 at offices of Rees, Llanelli

Elliott, Thomas Preston, Blunham, Bedford, Farmer. May 15 at 2 at offices of Hooper and Co, Biggleswade

Ewens, George Browne, Bridport, Dorset, Merchant. May 15 at 11 at offices of Loggin, Broad st

Ford, Samuel, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. May 16 at 11 at offices of Griffiths, Lad lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Gibbs, George Walter, High st, Canons town, Fruiterer. May 12 at 3 at offices of Godwin, North buildings, Finsbury. Anning, Buckerbury

Grant, Philip, Manchester, Agent. May 17 at 11 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Brown st, Manchester

Gillam, William Merritt Apear, and William Waltham Long, Manchester, Commission Merchants. May 15 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Earle and Co, Manchester
 Goodenough, John Sidney, Shepton Mallett, Somerset, Ironmonger. May 15 at 11 at the George Hotel, Shepton Mallett, Nalder, Shepton Mallett
 Griffiths, William, Neath, Glamorgan, Shoe Maker. May 15 at 12 at offices of Layson, James st, Neath
 Hadley, Pearce, Manasseh, Bow rd, Wine Merchant. May 11 at 3 at the Queen's Head Tavern, Great Tower st. Sorrell and Son, Great Tower st.
 Hall, Thomas, Melton Mowbray, Leicester, Hosiery. May 17 at 2.30 at offices of Barker, Jun, Leicester st, Melton Mowbray
 Harbour, James, Prince of Wales rd, Boot Maker. May 11 at 3 at offices of Christmas, Walbrook
 Hay, John, Shipley, York, Paper Manufacturer. May 24 at 3 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly, Bradford
 Hendley, Robert, Kingcombe, Hants, Beer Retailer. May 18 at 4 at the Dolphin Hotel, Romsey, Killiby, Southampton
 Hill, William, Bradford, York, Builder. May 10 at 11 at offices of Less and Co, New Ivesgate, Bradford
 Hirsh, Benjamin, Bradford, York, Printer's Warehouseman. May 16 at 3 at offices of Burley, Queengate, Bradford
 Hirst, James, Brookhouse, York, Cotton Operative. May 16 at 3 at offices of Mills, Byram buildings, Westgate, Huddersfield
 Holliswell, Frederick, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Engineer. May 19 at 2 at offices of Reader, Gray's Inn square
 Horfall, Joseph, Blackburn, Lancashire, Draper. May 12 at 11 at offices of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackfriars
 James, Edward John, Leamington terrace, The Grove, Hammersmith, Financial Agent. May 18 at 12 at offices of Coker, Cheshire, Gill, Cheshire
 Jenkins, Arthur, Llanvihangel Crucorney, Monmouth, Timber Merchant. May 17 at 3 at the Greyhound Hotel, Abergavenny. Jones, Abergavenny
 Jenkins, James, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Butcher. May 13 at 11 at offices of Thomas, Little Darkgate st, Aberystwith
 Levene, Wolff, Cardiff, Jeweller. May 16 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
 Leverton, Henry, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Picture Dealer. May 9 at 2 at offices of Staniford, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Lewis, John Harris, Newport, Monmouth, Draper. May 15 at 1 at offices of Tribe and Co, Moorgate
 Mansell, John, Bothamsall, Nottingham, Farmer. May 16 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Retford Railway Station. Mee and Co, East Retford
 Milson, William James, Tucker st, Canongate town, out of business. May 16 at 11 at 111, Cheapside. Philip, Bridge row, Cannon st
 Monkhouse, John, Kendal, Westmorland, Tailor. May 16 at 11 at offices of Bolton, Kent st, Kendal
 Mosley, William, Dilton, Durham, Builder. May 15 at 12 at offices of Garbutt, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Notley, Albert, Chard, Somerset, Ironmonger. May 17 at 11 at the Mermaid Hotel, Yeovil. Dommett and Canning, Chard
 Page, Philip Inglis, St Albans, Herts, Auctioneer. May 18 at 3 at offices of Lawrence and Co, Old Jewry chambers
 Parkhouse, John, Exeter, Merchant. May 17 at 2 at the Railway Hotel, Tiverton. Fryer
 Passe, George, Stoke-upon-Trent, Plumber. May 12 at 12 at the North-Western Hotel, Stafford. Bagnall, Stoke-upon-Trent
 Potts, Thomas William, Sandown, Isle of Wight, Builder. May 15 at 3 at offices of Fardell, Market st, Ryde
 Ridge, George, Cheltenham, Solicitor. May 16 at 3 at offices of Stroud, Clarence Parade, Cheltenham
 Robins, Thomas, Kidderminster, Worcester, Wine Merchant. May 17 at 3 at offices of Morton, Worcester st, Kidderminster
 Rose, George Wilkins, Birmingham, Clerk. May 15 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Weeks, Temple st, Birmingham
 Sayer, Henry, Hove, Sussex, Corn Dealer. May 15 at 3 at offices of Lamb, Ship st, Brighton
 Schmitz, Charles, Charles Fanl, and Jacques Speich, Liverpool, Merchants. May 25 at 2 at offices of Peacock and Cooper, Union court, Castle st, Liverpool
 Smart, William, Ambley, Sussex, Publican. May 15 at 12 at offices of Wood and Dempster, Ship st, Brighton
 Sommerville, Francis, Manchester, General Dealer. May 25 at 11 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Brown st, Manchester
 Stephens, Jeremiah, Cardiff, Tobacconist. May 15 at 11 at offices of Jenkins, High st, Cardiff. Morgan, Cardiff
 Stevens, Charles, Brighton, Sussex, Coachbuilder. May 15 at 3 at offices of Goodman, Prince Albert st, Brighton
 Strange, John, Spencer rd, Dartmouth park, Camden town, Assistant Railway Clearing House. May 21 at 3 at offices of Pope, Great James st, Bedford row
 Sturman, Edward Albert, Thicket rd, Penge, Schoolmaster. May 9 at 3 at offices of Nelson, Great Swan Alley, Moorgate
 Thompson, John, Liverpool, out of business. May 15 at 3 at offices of Blackhurst, Dale st, Liverpool
 Tomkies, Charles, Manchester, Architect. May 24 at 11 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Brown st, Manchester
 Wait, Adam, Bishop Middleham, Durham, Innkeeper. May 17 at 12 at offices of Granger, Saddler st, Durham
 Walton, Edmund, Norden, nr Rochdale, Lancashire, Travelling Draper. May 15 at 3 at offices of Standing, King st, South Parade, Rochdale
 Ward, Michael, and Robert Wind Ward, Manchester, Merchants. May 15 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester
 Warner, John, Leicester, Painter. May 15 at 3 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree gate, Leicester
 Webb, John, and Robert Webb, Barliss, Stafford, Rockingham Ware Manufacturers. May 5 at 3 at offices of Lee, Waterlow rd, Burslem
 Wells, Thomas, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Painter. May 17 at 2 at Sherry's Temperance Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Ralph
 Williams, John, Hatton garden, Jeweller. May 15 at 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Lewis and Lewis, Ely place, Holborn
 Woods, William Garrard, Ipswich, Suffolk, Coal Merchant. May 19 at 13 at offices of Jackson and Son, Silvert st, Ipswich
 Wooliscott, John, Oldham, Lancashire, Coal Merchant. May 19 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Clegg st, Oldham. Whittaker, Oldham

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S LIST OF ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT),

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

EVISON & BRIDGE,

22, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON,

LAW STATIONERS,

PRINTERS, AND PUBLISHERS OF LAW FORMS,

Have all the new Forms required by the Judicature Acts.

ALSO A GREAT VARIETY OF

BANKRUPTCY, PROBATE, and CONVEYANCING, GENERAL FORMS.

Where 100 copies of any form ordered, the solicitor's name, address, &c., inserted without extra charge. Statements, affidavits, &c.

Now ready, price 4d.

ORDERS as to the FEES and PERCENTAGES which are required to be taken in the Supreme Court of Judicature by means of Stamps. Dated April 22, 1876.

London: EVISON & BRIDGE, Printers, 22, Chancery-lane, W.C.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS,

192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

Carriage paid to the Country on Orders exceeding 20s.

BRICK PAPER, 6s, 6s 6d, 7s 6d, 7s 9d, and 9s 6d per ream.

BRIK PAPER, 15s 6d, 17s 6d, and 22s 6d per ream.

FOOLSCAP PAPER, 10s 6d, 14s 6d, and 18s 6d per ream.

CREAM-LAIN NOTE, 3s, 4s, and 5s per ream.

LARGE CREAM-LAIN NOTE, 4s 6d, 6s 6d, and 8s per ream.

LARGE BLUE NOTE, 3s 6d, 4s 6d, and 6s 6d per ream.

ENVELOPES, CREAM OR BLUE, 3s 9d, 4s 6d, and 6s 6d per 1000.

THE "TEMPLE" ENVELOPE, extra secure, 9s 6d, per 1000.

FOOLSCAP OFFICIAL ENVELOPES, 1s, 9d, per 100.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM WOOF CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 9s 6d per ream.

This incomparable Paper has raised up a host of worthless imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark, "PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM-WOOF CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.

INDENTURE SKINS, Printed and Machine-ruled, 2s 5d. each, 28s. doz., 12s 6d. per roll.

SECOND OR FOLLOWERS, Ruled, 2s. 1d. each, 24s. per dozen, 11s. per roll.

RECORDS OR MEMORIALS, 8d. each, 7s. 6d. per dozen.

LEDGERS, DAY BOOKS, CASH BOOKS, LETTER OR MINUTE BOOK

An immense stock in various bindings.

YATES & ALEXANDER,

PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,

ETC.

CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 22, CHANCERY-LANE,

LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits

Catalogues

Appeals

Prospectuses

Parliamentary Minutes

Magazines

Books

Newspapers

Pamphlets

Circulars

Reports

Posters

Rules

Handbills, &c., &c.